

# THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOL. I }  
No. I }

JANUARY, 1893

{ WHOLE No.  
I }

## EDITORIAL NOTE.

If any apology is needed for the establishment of *THE SCHOOL REVIEW* (and the editor recognizes that in this age of periodical literature the public has a right to some protection) it may perhaps be found in the fact that the cause of secondary education, to which the *REVIEW* is devoted, has within the last few months suffered a severe loss in the disappearance of two of its foremost organs. *The Academy* suspended publication last summer, *School and College* last month. The field which these journals filled, and filled so creditably, now lies vacant, and *THE SCHOOL REVIEW* hopes to occupy it.

The province of the new review, if described by institutions, is the High School and Academy; or, if described by courses of study, it embraces whatever lies between the subjects of the common school curriculum and the requirements for admission to college. Beyond this superior limit *THE REVIEW* will not trespass; and this restriction marks it off from journals of general education. On the other hand the line of demarcation between the common and the higher schools may not prove so absolute a boundary, but no excursion into the field of primary or elementary education will be made except for the purpose of gathering results that have some value for the work of secondary education. The problems of secondary education are so numerous and difficult, and they are so different from the problems of primary education, that they demand an organ for separate treatment. To be such an organ of secondary education is the mission of *THE*

41672

SCHOOL REVIEW. It addresses itself to principals, superintendents, teachers, and all others who take an intelligent interest in the work of the academy and the high school.

There is no class in the modern state which has more important functions than the educators. For the proper discharge of their highly responsible duties it is incumbent upon them to study education. Now education has two aspects, one theoretical, the other practical. The theory of education must be furnished by the students of mind,—by psychologists and philosophers. As Professor Laurie has recently said, in his profound work on the *Institutes of Education*, "a writer on the theory of education is really writing at once a theory of life and a treatise *De emendatione intellectus*, and he cannot dispense with a rational and rationalised scheme of mind." And at the present time when all sorts of educational changes are advocated under the name of reform, it seems very desirable to give some prominence to the philosophical basis of education, if we are not to be blown about by every fresh gust of novelty or prejudice. Still theory without facts is of little use. And, therefore, in addition to the principles on which his art is founded, the educator needs to know what experience has been made in the practice of the art. A really helpful journal of education, therefore, must be an open forum where the men who make educational experience come face to face with the men who generate educational theories and ideals. It is intended that the pages of THE SCHOOL REVIEW shall be such a meeting-place of the philosophy and the practice of education. And the support and co-operation already promised by superintendents and principals and teachers in active service as well as by professed students of the sciences of mind are a guarantee that the new periodical will not miss its end.

The REVIEW is not the organ of any institution, or of any sect, or of any interest. Supported by the publication fund of the Sage School of Philosophy in Cornell University—a school

which includes chairs both of Psychology and Pedagogy—the REVIEW, unhampered by financial problems and unassailed by the temptations to which they give rise, has absolutely no other aim than to propagate sound educational thought and report wise educational experiment in all matters pertaining to the work of the high school and academy. These results will be of slow attainment; and much discussion must be held and many trials must be made. The problems of education, like the problems of philosophy, are never finally settled, but always in a process of settlement; and every advance in knowledge and experience makes it necessary to reconsider them. The REVIEW will exhibit the process as well as the result of this healthful fermentation. Catholic and impartial in tone and spirit, it will give an equal hearing to both sides of every unsettled question.

Besides original articles on the theory and practice of secondary education the REVIEW will devote a large amount of space to the consideration of current publications in secondary education. Books intended for use in high schools and academies, and books helpful to those who teach in them, will all be noticed, and the more important works will be put in the hands of specialists for careful and authoritative treatment. Furthermore as much of the best educational literature is to be found in journals which are generally inaccessible to teachers, the REVIEW will present a digest of the most important articles appearing in periodicals, especially the foreign periodicals, which have to do with secondary education. In this way the REVIEW will become the exponent of the world's best thought and practice in the field of secondary education.

But enough of promise, and now to the performance! And yet one word more should be added, and that a personal one. The editor of THE SCHOOL REVIEW may be asked to show *his* credentials. He will therefore make the following declaration. He took up the work because, though many were qualified, no one was actually doing it; and he may plead, in self-defence, a

high appreciation of the teacher's calling, a sense of the capital importance of secondary education for the entire fabric of our civilization, and a personal experience in every grade of teaching from the primary through the secondary schools to the college and university. If, however, the editor can succeed in making **THE SCHOOL REVIEW** the embodiment of his own ideal of a journal of secondary education, no apology will be needed either for his duty or its existence.

—J. G. Schurman.

---

### **The Teacher as a Professional Expert.**

Nearly fifty years ago an eminent professor of Harvard University, then occupying the chair of History, got into a controversy over an article which he had written about a popular hero ; although his criticism was probably just, the feeling against him was so strong that it was deemed expedient to transfer him to the chair of " Natural Religion and Moral Philosophy." A squib expressed the popular feeling on the subject as follows : " Professor B. has been a Professor of History because he did not know history ; but is now a Professor of Morals because he cannot tell the truth."

The anecdote illustrates the lack of confidence of Americans in professional teachers ; but the same feeling exists toward many other professions. For instance, when it became necessary to erect a capitol for the nation in 1800 it was designed, says Henry Adams " by Dr. William Thornton, an English physician, who in the course of two weeks study at the Philadelphia Library gained enough knowledge of architecture to draw an exterior elevation. But when Thornton was forced to look for some one to help him out of the difficulty, Jefferson could find no competent native American and sent for Latrobe. Jefferson considered himself a better architect than either of them and had he been a professor of materia medica at Columbia College the public would have accepted his claim as reasonable." Wherever we turn we find the same notion that even in technical matters one man is as good as another ; house painters design buildings, surveyors build bridges, and war correspondents write history. Even when we touch the most delicate and complicated of all the



machinery of government, we find deeply imbedded in the popular mind the principle of rotation in office; that is, Americans hold not only the belief that the inexperienced man is as good as the expert, but the conviction that he is a great deal better.

For this state of things there are two principal reasons. In the development of a new country men have had to be masters of many trades; and the man who could clear land, break oxen, build a wagon, shoe a horse, repair a roof, keep a tavern, and settle a dispute, not unnaturally felt that he could also invent cotton machinery, make laws and teach school. The division and sub-division of labor must eventually break up this idea that any man can do anything. The other cause is one which tends rather to grow than to diminish; it is hard for Americans to understand that it is possible for men to be politically equal while intellectually unequal. The "practical man" considers himself an unteachable master in his own field, and at the same time a better judge of professional matters than the expert who has spent his life in acquiring technical knowledge. On the other hand, he has the utmost contempt for any application to his pursuits of those generalities founded on long experience which he calls "theory." Only a few months ago in the enlightened city of Boston the trustees of the Public Library applied their business common sense to the construction of a new building, and declined to consult any experienced librarian as to the suitability of their plans. These practical men have produced a magnificent monument, with insufficient windows, and were able to come within almost a million dollars of their own estimate.

That this is the expressed feeling of the mass of Americans is sufficiently shown by examining the status of the recognized "learned professions." The ministry is the oldest of them, and long the most respected; yet laymen consider their knowledge of biblical history and philology so adequate that they try for heresy learned scholars who disagree with them. The profession of law was looked on with suspicion and dislike in colonial times, and owes its present standing chiefly to its great influence over legislation, and to the selection of judges from its ranks. No established profession meets with less real consideration than the medical; a few years ago in the great city of Cleveland the physician with the largest practice was an ignorant German who never showed a diploma and who diagnosed diseases by examin-

ing the palms of his patients' hands. The officers of the army and navy have slowly gained a distinct professional status, and engineers and scientific men are somewhat grudgingly admitted into that category.

What is the teacher's place? How far does the public recognize him as one entitled to confidence and consultation, as one learned in a calling of great benefit to the community? Three illustrations drawn from personal experience may suffice to show how the teachers, the largest body of educated men and women, are regarded. A person, a foreigner, who has for some months rendered practical services in the writer's kitchen, one day asked the lady of the house whether her husband "had any real profession." The wife of another member of the teaching staff in Cambridge, one day remarked that—"she never could see what President Eliot could find to do." A young friend who had been a "professor" in an immature college in the Southwest told me that he thought of "going into the educational business." It appeared that his plan was to start a school, and then personally to "drum" whole cities for patrons—or perhaps one might say, customers.

What is the reason of this attitude toward knowledge? Savages despise experts because they have no conception of any knowledge except that they themselves possess; just as the barbarian Gaul plucked the Roman senator by the beard, out of curiosity. The Romans cared little for learning because they could not see the value of knowledge which was not directly intended to advance the material power and wealth of the nation. Americans are rather Romans than barbarians; we value some kinds of experts; we allowed forty acres at the World's Fair for the display of the cattle-breeders' art—and two acres for a display of education.

Perhaps after all these are extreme illustrations of the relative proportions of material and intellectual interests. Perhaps we may find the status of teachers more important than we imagine. Let us proceed to consider three points in regard to it: first, how far teachers practice a profession; second, how far they are recognized as experts; and, third, what may be done to improve the profession.

There are three principal marks of a profession: that it should be a permanent calling taken up as a life-work; that it should

require special and intellectual training ; and that there should be among members a feeling of common interest and some organization. When we attempt to apply these criteria to the teachers there is certainly some doubt whether we form a profession or no. The teacher's calling is well-known to be less permanent than others. For more than a century teaching has been considered in this country, what it could hardly be in any other country, a makeshift for young men who expect to enter law or medicine. Undoubtedly this system of combining self-education with the education of others has made it possible for many young men to climb the difficult lower stairs of other professions. Two presidents of the United States, John Adams and James Garfield, began their career in this fashion. The conditions are now changing ; the colleges used to have a system of vacations which permitted its students to teach a part of every year. Perhaps that was as good a way of earning money as waiting at summer hotels or acting as guide at a World's Fair ; but the colleges no longer suffer the interruption. More and more young men enter upon teaching with the expectation that they will follow it steadily ; and so far forth the profession gains ground. On the other hand, we in America have large bodies of women teachers ; and to them no profession has the same permanence as to a man, the "epidemic of matrimony" sometimes makes inroads on the teaching force in every grade. A few months ago the President of the oldest and one of the best women's colleges in America was in a comical state of mingled wrath and amusement because one of his professors had, a few days before the beginning of the college year, resigned her place, in order to be married.

When we come to technical training, the teachers stand below other professions. Only very recently have there been opportunities in America for a training corresponding to that of the law, medical, or theological student, or of the West Point Cadet. I do not mean to leave out of account the system of Normal Schools which has done so much to disabuse Americans of the idea that any fairly intelligent person is suitable as a teacher. It seems, however, that the Normal Schools at present occupy the same position as the old Medical Schools, which gave diplomas after attendance on two courses of lectures. The Normal Schools have tried to do two things at once, and have done neither of them with complete success ; they found it necessary to offer a

general course because of the imperfect preliminary education of many students who came to them ; and at the same time they have tried practical training ; the general course has been on too narrow a basis, and the practical part has been taught too much by lecture and demonstration, and too little by actual practice. Nor do the college courses in pedagogy entirely fill the requirement of higher professional training ; they can test the general acquirements of students ; they can point out the development of the human mind and suggest the best ways of participating in that development ; they can give a wide outlook over previous experiments in education ; their great danger is of running into what the Germans call "methodologie." Practical training in teaching seems to me like that in another science which makes the colleges known throughout the Union—the science of football. The good teacher needs strength and quickness of mind ; he needs an acquaintance with the rules of the game ; above all he needs personal contact with the problems of his calling. It is impossible to educate a teacher without associating him in some way with those who are to be taught, just as it is impossible to make a good football eleven by studying the rules of the game and looking on from the edge of the crowd. A normal school or a college course without actual classes of children is like football practice with a dummy in a gymnasium. The last element of professional training, professional organization and association, has made great advances in the last four years.

Such, then seems to be the opinion which we teachers hold of our calling ; it is not always permanent ; we are not always well trained ; but we have a strong and growing feeling of *esprit du corps*. What does the community think of us ? In one respect at least teachers are looked up to as professional experts ; they are generally considered men of learning. There is a much greater respect throughout the country for educated men than they themselves observe. A few months ago a young lawyer in New York City was designated as an agent of a municipal reform association at one of the polling places in the lower part of the city. On appearing he found his rivals disposed to hustle and maltreat him ; presently "Paddy Divver" the renowned police justice, appeared as chieftain of the opposite host ; on learning who the young stranger was, and finding that he was an educated—and withal an agreeable, young fellow—Paddy magnanimously took

him under his wing ; issued strict orders that he should not be molested ; gave him an excellent Tammany lunch ; and parted with an assurance of his personal friendship. He had nothing to gain except the good will of the man whose advantages he respected. From the district school where "the teacher says so" is a decisive argument in domestic affairs, to the gentleman who has discovered an infallible means of predicting the weather and asks the Board of Overseers of Harvard College to test and certify to his fame, there is a disposition to look upon educators as more learned than other professional men. This privilege, however, applies only to literary subjects ; treated in a general manner, we are allowed to state the height of the Washington Monument, but to apply the character of Washington as a criterion for modern statesmen is a descent into politics.

What we desire is not that people should look upon us as encyclopaedias of learning, but that they should ask and take our advice upon strictly professional matters, such as school organization, courses of study, and school methods. The real difficulty here is the close connection between the public schools and the state. The teachers are not considered members of an independent profession, asserting their own standards, but as employees of the government ; they are not retained like lawyers, but hired like letter carriers. Furthermore, since education is a public matter, education is considered the gift of the government, to be divided per capita among the children in such a manner that the bright and the dull shall get the same amount in the same time, under the same system. That notion goes very deep. Congress looks upon the scientific man in the Smithsonian and instructors in government schools, as persons to take orders and not to make suggestions. Teachers throughout the country have little influence over the organization of their own schools, and still less over the selection of their own associates.

On this point our position is more difficult than that of other professions ; lawyers have a bar examination, which they themselves administer ; doctors, in the older states, have a high professional standard of education and will eventually reach a state examination. We are betrayed by our own higher institutions : you may count almost on one hand the colleges and even universities in which the faculties are the main-spring of the system. In Cornell, Columbia, Yale and Harvard the faculty does decide

on its own methods ; and at Yale and Cornell on its own members. The success of those great universities is in part due to the independence of their teachers. Even the Overseers of Harvard University, though enlightened and public spirited men, chosen by the suffrage of the graduates, have very little control over the University. Had they more power, they might make it better, they certainly would make it different. A few of the endowed schools have a faculty with power ; but in public schools there is almost always an administrative system. If the principal of the grammar school never asks the opinion of his teachers ; if the head-master of a high school never takes council with the sub-masters, why should principals and masters expect to be consulted by school boards ? Our idea of school organization is paternal : it reminds one of the Presbyterian's elaborate description of his own church government : " And thus you see," said he, " our General Assembly, our Presbyteries, our Synods form a system of wheels, working within wheels." " Yes," said a good Methodist brother, " and all these wheels to grind the people with."

It is true that the taxpayers raise the money, and that it is necessary for the public interest that they should have a voice in its expenditure ; it is true that we need the criticism of the intelligent laymen. But our schools and particularly the public schools would be much better administered if the Boards of Education were content with supervising the Superintendent, and would give the teachers more voice in their own system ; if Superintendents were content with superintending methods and would leave details to the masters ; and if the masters would call their teachers into consultation.

In any case we do ask that our opinions may have weight in the details of the schools, and especially over the selection of studies. Here if anywhere experience and observation ought to tell, and here we teachers are in part responsible for the defects of the present system. To be sure many teachers are caught in the meshes of a system which they did not make, and against which they struggle. Nevertheless, an evidence of life in other professions is eagerness of their members to adopt improved methods and to extend them. The author of a legal treatise on a new system at once acquires reputation in the profession ; the leading physician is usually the man who is most ready to try



new remedies ; the more conservative profession of the ministry blossoms out with suggestions of institutional churches and other novel devices for extending the work. Teachers are too apt to look upon the teacher who points out flaws as a spy in the camp. We ought to be constantly suggesting improvements in our own work, and we ought to accept outside criticisms as an evidence of public interest. Woe to the schools in which teachers or administrators consider any part of the system "perfect" !

Nor is content with imperfection the only danger of the schools: a fixed and artificial system of education not only benumbs the teachers, it also creates a distrust in the minds of the public. Some very excellent and sincere educators have worked out elaborate theories in which the schools are fitted together like the trusses of a bridge : the primary schools, they tell us, are to teach a knowledge of things ; the grammar schools, a knowledge of relations ; the high schools, applications of knowledge ; and the work in each grade is to be arranged accordingly. Such wire-drawn formalism brings the school into discredit. The human mind develops on all sides at once ; astronomy may be a suitable study for primary schools : and word building is a useful exercise in graduate schools.

The most technical part of the teacher's work is his method of teaching ; here again the profession suffers from itself. The general public feels that we use a lot of professional cant ; that certain stock phrases are used to cover a plentiful lack of wit. The spirit of a profession may fairly be gauged by its periodicals ; the lawyers, the doctors, the ministers discuss the technicalities of their professions in sober, dignified, and literary fashion. It must be confessed that many of the educational periodicals suggest inferior education : they abound in small gossip, in laudatory book notices, in free-and-easy conversational editorials. It would be unfair to hold the publishers wholly responsible for this sort of journals, because they adapt their wares to the markets. It must be the teachers who subscribe for, and support, what might not inappropriately be called the "trade journals of education." One of our present encouragements is the establishment in the United States of several periodicals of the highest order, suitable exchanges for the best journals of other countries.

In what way may the professional status of the teacher be improved ? That it is rising is shown in many ways, especially in

the better provision for thorough training. In the first place the Normal Schools are improving, in the second place a scientific study of pedagogy is slowly gaining recognition as a part of University instruction, a third method is starting up of which a special advantage is that it may be applied to teachers who have already begun their work. This is the system of training courses established for teachers by colleges and technical schools. The Lowell Institute has for several years provided lecture courses for teachers in connection with the Institute of Technology of Boston; Harvard University is this year offering courses to the Grammar School teachers of the city of Cambridge, which are still more practical because they include laboratory exercises. This is a kind of university extension in which many colleges might be useful, and which many School Boards might well accept and pay for. In Cambridge so far but three courses have been offered, geometry, physical geography, and experimental physics; the system may perhaps be extended to include the more familiar branches. The probable effect in bringing about a feeling of harmony and mutual interest between the colleges and schools is too evident to require discussion.

In some one of the three ways, by normal schools, courses in pedagogy, or practical training courses, greater professional advantages are obtainable: more than that, they are obtained. The planting of Johns-Hopkins University twenty years ago has given a different trend to the preparation of teachers for colleges. There is hardly a good college in the United States at present which will give any man a permanent appointment unless he has special training in American or foreign Universities, after finishing his college course. The principal is extending into secondary schools; and the time is not far distant when a mastership in any good secondary school in New England can be had only by a person specially fitted for the work which he proposes to do. The influence is likely to spread still further and we shall surely have a body of highly educated and trained teachers below the High School. At this moment there are in the Cambridge Grammar Schools several teachers who hold the degree of A.B. from a good college; and the number of such thoroughly educated teachers is certain to increase.

Our standing before the community may also be much improved by a less self-satisfied tone. We are engaged in an ex-

cellent and honorable calling ; we have chosen it because we think it for us the best and the most useful ; but teachers are entirely too apt to congratulate each other on the grandeur of their opportunities and the greatness of their sacrifices. We are not highly paid in comparison with our friends and class-mates who began the race with us ; we are subject to vexatious uncertainties as to tenure and promotion. But we have three months vacation in the year ; we have fixed salaries instead of fees or donation parties ; and we are able to arrange much of our own time. We look, and are, a contented body of men and women ; let us accept our content.

Another way to improve our position is to recognize the problem of education which lies before us. An esteemed correspondent from another state recently wrote : " I think we have touched the bottom of inequality and are now well on our way toward another grand equality. . . . One object of free public education should be to make men equal and not unequal." That proposition is in the wrong spirit. It is no part of our profession to reorganize the Universe. We are put here, like the doctors, to take people as we find them, and to make the best that we can out of every one. A good physician treats a weak and sickly child as one requiring special attention : he thinks he is doing well if he brings him to the point where by taking care of himself he may live very simply and quietly. The stronger and more vigorous boy may be a subject for the sharper discipline of rough and hearty boyish sports. But if we wish to produce a transcendent character like the stroke oar of a victorious crew, we must catch him early and train him hard. There is no other profession that does not seek out the best young minds and give them the best opportunities that the country affords. We shall never be a profession if we do not take each child as we find him, and give him all the training that his mental powers allow, up to the point reached by our schools.

The status of teachers would be much improved if we could reach the foreign system of a rigorous state examination, which could not be passed without special training, and without which no person could be appointed as teacher in any advanced school. That is a result very difficult to accomplish : the bar has gained it ; the medical men may reach it ; the teachers, at least in some states, might bring it about if they, themselves, would clamor

for it. Our system of schools conducted exclusively by local boards, with little suggestion and no control from the state, has great advantages; it promotes healthy rivalries, allows for peculiar circumstances and cultivates lively public interest. None of these advantages would be lost by a system of state examinations; and we should oblige all the local boards to build with well shaped materials.

The members of the profession are already doing all that can be expected in the way of organization and association; the knowledge of improved methods spreads rapidly through teachers' associations, and through the better journals, from town to town and from state to state. What is now needed is to apply the principle of association to bring nearer together the teachers who are nearest together; the teachers in one building, or in one city. This does not mean simply the outward contact of teachers' meetings, but the establishment of some kind of joint and several responsibility, some faculty system. The difficulties in the way of such a system are very serious. The adoption of departmental instruction in Grammar Schools—which seems impending—would help out this reform; but the real trouble is not so much a lack of organization as of enlightened public sentiment. In this, as in many other improvements, we are in the hands of that near-sighted giant, the Public; he moves us about like chess men on a board; he is responsible for most of the evils which we have discussed. We feel toward him as the Red Queen felt when she was suddenly transported to the mantel-piece, and with her we cry out to our colleagues: "Mind the Volcano!" But he is a good natured and well meaning giant, susceptible to good advice. He likes to see his creatures doing something and is willing that they should improve. Good Public, give us elbow room! Do not insist on uniformity, the great bane of American education! Do not make a solar system of our schools, with superintendents as force-giving suns, masters as light-reflecting planets, and teachers as automatic satellites or asteroids! Give us an opportunity to think, to suggest and to criticise, without our heads rolling off! We will repay you by preparing for our profession, practicing it modestly, and constantly raising our own standards of efficiency. You give us your children to educate; give us more freedom, so as to educate them well!

—Albert Bushnell Hart.

*Harvard University.*

**First Year English in the High School.**

The question of curriculum of study for the public schools seems doomed always to have "the wolf on this side, the dog on that." The people are pulling one way, demanding that their children shall have a mixture of the useful and the ornamental, and caring little for rules of logical order or theories of philosophic method; while the higher institutions are pulling in the opposite direction, insisting that the aim of the lower schools shall be to meet the conditions of admission within their doors. The matter-of-fact business man calls the public schools to an account, if his son lacks his own facility and accuracy in measuring wood or in writing and computing the interest on a promissory note; the mother surrounded by the refining influences of wealth does not understand why her daughter is not allowed to pursue the study of French in the grammar school; the clergyman preaches against the superficiality of public school training, if a girl in his Sunday School happens not to know where Antioch is; and the college professor cares only that the freshman's knowledge meet the exactions of his particular examinations. The business man gives but little credit to the schools for the general discipline they afford, which makes it possible for the young graduate, by a little special attention, to do anything of a business nature he is likely to be called upon to do; the clergyman, from the character of his study so familiar with biblical geography, fails to consider the necessary scope of a modern child's knowledge of places, and overlooks the fact that the girl referred to would pass a better general examination in the subject of geography than he himself could pass; and the professor seems not to be aware that there are other educational interests as important as those in which he is specially concerned. The golden rule for the teacher is: Consider the rights of others; your department of instruction is not the only one.

There is a tendency in meetings like this to discuss principles and abstractions rather than what relates to practice. In this paper an attempt is made to treat in a plain manner and briefly a simple matter of practical bearing, which is just now receiving considerable attention from both teachers and the public.

The question of giving the study of English greater prominence

in our secondary courses of study has already passed through the necessary stage of agitation, and it is now in order to examine a no less important phase—how this is to be done.

In the ardor which accompanies new movements there is danger of claiming too much of prerogative for the reform aimed at, sometimes even to ignoring the rights of other things. In a well planned course of study there are other branches just as dear to us as English, and it should be our aim to make the introduction into this course of anything new as little prejudicial to what is already legitimately there as possible.

No satisfactory agreement has yet been reached as to what constitutes English. Those most enthusiastic in urging its claims to greater prominence in our scheme of popular education are wide apart in their respective estimates of what its essentials are. In our attempt to find in the high school at least one year where this subject shall have a permanent place as a daily recitation, none of its salient features will be overlooked. By "first year English in the high school" is meant composition, literature, and oral reading, including whatever may be implied by these. This would mean elementary rhetoric with some attention to such matters as etymology, punctuation, figures of speech, style, and diction; the cultivation of a taste for classic literature by the study of a few of the best American authors; and the laying of the foundation of graceful and intelligent oral reading, with special attention to orthoepy, physical posture, elocution, and intelligent interpretation of thought.

The teaching of such English as this is not to require the services of an enthusiast or a prodigy for an instructor, one whose success is dependent upon his being swept along by a tide of inspiration, but it is to be done by ordinary teachers working within the usual limitations of their profession. If, as is usually the case, these teachers have not been trained for the work, they must learn to do by doing, as is often the case with the best teachers of other subjects.

Until recently English, as here outlined, was treated in the high school as something incidental, to receive attention once a week, or even less frequently, like music, drawing, or current topics. If rhetoric was taught as a regular daily class-room subject, it was for the benefit of only a few. What we are claiming in this paper is, that all high school students, of whatever course,



should have English as a first year study, and that it have the same amount of time and attention daily that is now given to algebra or Latin.

A few years ago complaints began to be made generally that the history of our own country was too much neglected in the public schools. Previously the public conscience had tried to quiet itself with the baseless theory, that the child obtains by general reading all that is desirable in this direction. It was found in fact that there is no such amount of general reading of history as had been claimed; that the young rarely read history at all of their own accord. The usual period of preliminary agitation was passed through; the public was at length sufficiently aroused in regard to the matter; a permanent place for this important branch of study was found in the grammar school; and, in consequence, the graduates from our grammar schools are now well informed about American History. Although a single year of English can accomplish but little when compared with the results of a year's study of American History, it would be a most significant little, to be felt appreciably ever after.

To make it worth the while, as has been said already, English must be taught somewhere in the course with the same insistence upon regular class room work as is the case with geometry. All things considered, the earlier this teaching comes in the high school the better. If placed in the first year, nearly three times as many would receive its benefits as would be the case if deferred until senior year, and it would make possible a greater degree of success with the subsequent incidental rhetorical work of the school. Moreover, the influence of this first year's discipline in English would be felt to advantage everywhere in the student's later career. Teachers of higher classes would then oftener experience satisfaction in finding boys and girls somewhat trained to write and punctuate, to appreciate literary excellence, and to give pleasure instead of pain when called upon to read or recite orally.

Fewer persons are fitted to teach English than almost any other important branch of study. As a rule young teachers are unwilling to take it, as they have not been sufficiently instructed in it themselves. As soon, however, as English shall be taught daily in the class room, and to all the pupils of a given year, just as Latin or algebra is taught, there will be produced, by a natural

process, competent teachers of English, and it will become a favorite subject with them, as by good right it ought to be. Rousseau, whose financial distress compelled him on one occasion to affect a calling for which he was not qualified, said : "By continuing to teach music I insensibly gained some knowledge of it."

There must be several teachers of first year English in a high school, just as there must be several to teach algebra. It would be well if all were to have the discipline that some teaching of English would give them. Their good influence for English would then be felt all along the course, as every subject affords more or less opportunity for it. Teachers of other branches too commonly decline to take notice of errors in English, such as mistakes of orthoepy in translating, and errors of punctuation in written exercises.

Fortunately we have quite lost confidence in the principle once held to some extent, that for the writing of good English it is only necessary to get something to say, and that then there will be no difficulty in saying it properly. One needs to be trained in literary composition just as he must be trained in anything else. Only now and then a genius, like Hawthorne, can dispense with passing through "the green age of apprenticeship" as a writer. You may have heard of the Bachelor of Arts who found it necessary to take a post-graduate course in spelling. Almost any college graduate might consistently take such a course in English. It is a common regret with educated men that they had not been stimulated in early life to write perseveringly, until they had formed the taste for literary composition.

If emphasis is to be put upon either composition or the study of literature in first year classes, it should be given to the former. Brief compositions should be required daily, or nearly so, and at first no subject is too simple to be successfully employed. It will be remembered that Swift could write elegantly about a broomstick. Several of these brief compositions should be read aloud and criticised by the teacher before the class each day, that all the members of the class may be benefited by the originality of each, as well as by the criticisms that accompany the reading. The compositions the teacher lacks time to read may often be assigned for correction to the most competent members of the class. Nearly the whole question of teaching composition writ-

ing in the schools, especially in its early stages, is expressed in this,—*regular daily class exercise, a part of which is to be the discussion by the teacher in the presence of the class of the work done.* By such daily contact with the individual student the teacher gets the surest revelation of the deficiencies of his class.

It is not to be expected that students so young as those entering the high school should pay much attention to style and invention, but rather to accurate and grammatical expression of common-place thought.

Literary composition is generally at the outset distasteful; but if persevered in, the student comes in time to have a liking for it, and finds, as often happens, that an acquired taste is stronger than a natural one. A good illustration of the utter helplessness of a beginner when set unaided to the task of writing a composition, is the case of a bright girl of thirteen, who chose "Religion" as her subject, and wrote as follows: "There are a great many kinds of religion. There is the Presbyterian religion, the Episcopalian religion, the Baptist religion, the Roman Catholic religion, the Unitarian religion, the Universalist religion, and the Methodist religion." This list exhausted the church denominations in her own village; but by enumerating others less familiar to her, and not forgetting the Mormons, she succeeded in reaching the required minimum limit of fifty words, and at length breathed freely in the consciousness of having achieved one of those terrible things called compositions.

The art of literary composition requires long and patient practice, intelligence that comes only by study, and mature judgment which nothing but time can fully develop. A French writer of great distinction says: "With whatever talent a man may be born, the art of writing is not easily learned." An experienced author was once asked if he would encourage young people in writing poetry. "By all means," he replied; "the poetry will, of course, be good for nothing; but the practice will be most helpful to them in forming the habit of careful thinking, and especially in giving them facility in diction, which will be of real use in their less ambitious efforts at prose."

The advisability of using a text-book in teaching first year composition is not quite established. This is a question to be decided by the individual teacher. While a few work best without one, probably the majority would prefer to use one; and possibly all would find it helpful, if it were not too much relied upon.

The amount of literature that can be studied in one year by boys and girls who have just entered the high school, especially when only a part of each daily recitation can be made available for it, is not large, and there is abundant material that may be profitably used for that purpose. Many American authors could be readily suggested, any one of whom, whether poet or prose-writer, would suffice. But the aim of the teacher, so far as this feature of English is concerned, should be to direct the student in such classic lines of reading as he is likely to follow perseveringly and voluntarily. Experience seems to show that the only literature likely to meet these conditions is prose fiction. As the study of literature in the class-room implies and necessitates much independent and voluntary reading by the pupil out of school, the teacher is at once called upon to find for his ambitious youthful readers a sufficiency of real classic fiction, attractive and pure, and consequently such as he may safely and confidently recommend to them. Such prose fiction as this is not abundant. Hardly any classic of this nature is wholly free from impurities, the best and most attractive in other respects often being the most vitiated. To become satisfied of this, let any one of you attempt to recommend to a girl of ravenous literary appetite unobjectionable classic fiction sufficient to supply her for a single year. Go to your own libraries and select the novels by the English masters, which you can consistently recommend to her. When it is stated that you are likely to begin by rejecting all of Thackeray, Scott, and Fielding, the real difficulty of the case becomes plain.

It seems like sacrilege to expurgate the works of such authors as Stern, Victor Hugo, and Bulwer, to make them safe reading for the young; but much may be said in favor of so doing. A teacher with the true literary spirit, in selecting reading for his pupils, will naturally choose a classic if possible; but as he must, nine times out of ten, select a story, and finds nearly all the stories written by classical authors containing what it would be imprudent to place before the unsophisticated reader, the necessity for some process of expurgation with the best novels becomes apparent. Even "Gulliver" has been successfully cleansed and made readable for the young. Great stress is laid upon fiction, because naturally the youthful taste is for stories, and it is wise to indulge this taste, if it can be done with what is strictly within the domain of literary art. Probably twenty young people will-

ingly read fiction for every one who reads standard history or poetry of his own accord. In a high school of five hundred it would be surprising if more than one were found who had read all of Wordsworth, or one even who had read all of Bancroft's History of the United States. This taste for history and poetry can be only moderately forced. Time alone develops it. I once knew a lawyer of decided literary taste who neglected to read Hudibras until he was quite advanced in years. He said he had always known that it was a great poem, because his cultivated father had early pointed it out to him as a book he would some day delight in.

For the successful taking up of some authors it makes a great difference at what place in his works one begins. As an introduction to Carlyle, "On Heroes" might charm a reader who would find his "French Revolution" hopelessly disgusting. A young person might be pleased with the "Blithedale Romance," who could see nothing of worth in the matchless introduction to the "Scarlet Letter."

The teacher of wide reading should make a lasting impression upon these boys and girls of fifteen, laying the foundation of what will later be a genuine literary culture. The amount of knowledge actually acquired may not be large; it will be like seed well sown, to come to an unfailing fruition later.

Oral reading is included among the essentials of first year English, because it is desirable that no educated person should be without this accomplishment. The extent to which our high schools neglect oral reading is deplorable. The observation once made by a critical teacher after a week of visitation in city high schools will not surprise any one,—that it was something of a consolation to know that the school she herself was connected with was not the only one that produced poor readers. It is of quite common observation that the best read student is the worst reader; just as it is often noticed that the man who leads his class writes a wretched hand.

Oral reading should form a part, perhaps a subordinate part, of first year English; if for nothing else, to form thoroughly the habit of a critical pronunciation of English. Moreover, good oral reading is an accomplishment to be coveted, even if our customary manner of educating holds it of but little value.

The pupil should be stimulated to practice oral reading daily

at home, thus supplementing the too meagre exercises of the school.

This plea for first year English in the high school is made upon the presumption that for the three remaining years of the course the usual attention to incidental rhetorical work will be fully sustained, and to a much better purpose. It is also believed that such an impulse will be given by this year of English in the way of literary culture, as shall last to enrich a lifetime.

The plan hastily outlined in this paper has been tried for nearly two years in the Worcester High School, and through the zeal and enlightened efforts of more than half a dozen teachers it has proved its worth. It has been favored by intelligent enthusiasm, an enthusiasm, which has been fostered by the formation of a Fortnightly English Club, in which there has been a free discussion of methods of procedure, by means of which the originality of the individual teacher could be freely copied and made available by all. A careful and frequent inspection of the peculiar excellence of each teacher's work by the principal, has also made it possible for him to present at these fortnightly meetings the good results observed. Several of these teachers, at the request of the principal, recently prepared statements of their impressions as to what is most essential to be done in classes of first year English. The substance of these impressions will now be presented as the conclusion of this paper.

#### I.—CONCERNING COMPOSITION WRITING.

Insist upon daily work in composition. This is the all-important feature.

Aim at developing the ability to think clearly, and a facility in writing accurate—not necessarily elegant—English.

Insist upon correct paragraphing in all original work.

Let the pupils to some extent, correct one another's written work, especially after the teacher has criticised as many papers as practicable before the class.

Require all corrected compositions to be re-written in accordance with suggestions of the teacher.

In marking them use a system of signs, and place the characters in the margin, leaving the pupil to find his errors for himself.

Teach clearness and unity, and the common figures of speech.



Correct in the class a great variety of faulty sentences.

Require the learning of essential rules for punctuation, and illustrate each by examples.

At first have the pupil write short compositions, not continuous, some of them on subjects that cannot be "looked up." Then require longer ones, continuous from day to day, upon books read outside the class.

## II.—CONCERNING LITERATURE.

Require daily in the class a certain amount of study of some American author.

Require much reading in the class and in private, what is read being frequently reported orally to the class.

Require committing to memory of beautiful selections.

Cultivate in the pupil the habit of looking carefully to the authority of a statement.

See that the pupil acquires the ability to locate quickly the difficulty in the failure to understand any sentence.

Be sure to make a beginning in the cultivation of the literary taste, and of a desire to read only the best.

Dictate, as a part of the advance lesson, questions which will compel the pupil to think out the answers.

The looking up of allusions is valuable, but too much of such work wearies young pupils. Make this subordinate to work which will stimulate their imagination and arouse a liking for the beautiful in literature and nature.

Give written lessons on the plot, characters, and figurative or obscure expressions after study of a selection.

## III.—CONCERNING ORAL READING.

Devote some small portion of each recitation to oral reading, and, if possible, have each pupil read aloud daily at home.

Require reading and reciting from the platform.

Give some attention to suffixes and prefixes, and to the derivation of words.

Require the defining of new words, to enlarge the pupils vocabulary; old words, to make his knowledge accurate.

Have the pupil acquire the power to read at sight without blundering, as well as secure a working knowledge of the strict meaning of words.

—J. G. Wright. ✓

*Classical High School, Worcester, Mass.*

**Regents' Diplomas and School Certificates in English.**

That the work now accomplished by the English department of Cornell is unsatisfactory is a proposition that needs no demonstration. Complaints are made on all sides, by professors in science no less than by professors in history and literature, that their students are unable to write tolerable examination-papers and graduation-theses. The writers, they say, do not express themselves in a clear and orderly manner, they misuse words, they seem to be ignorant of punctuation, they even spell badly.

The evil is not confined to Cornell. Harvard is troubled in like manner. The recent Harvard report is too familiar to us all to need more than a passing mention. Whether Cornell is better or worse than her sister institutions is a question which cannot be settled and need not be raised. The comparison, even were it possible, could not help us. Our sole duty is to diagnose the ailment and apply the remedy.

I have been necessarily slow in arriving at my conclusions. Two years ago I was a stranger to Cornell ways. I could proceed only cautiously, reconnoitring the ground in every direction. During the past college year I satisfied myself that the root of the trouble lay in our method of admission. Theoretically our entrance requirements in English are fairly sufficient. But practically they are not enforced for the great majority of candidates.

Three fourths of our annual matriculants are admitted upon Regents' diploma or upon equivalent school certificate. This practice is, I am satisfied, a grave mistake, for English certainly. Whether it works satisfactorily in other studies is a question that I do not undertake to investigate. I have my doubts.

It is the object of the present paper, then, to set forth the grounds upon which my conviction rests, to justify the demand for abolishing entrance-certificates in English. Also, and chiefly, to state—as fully as space will permit—the kind of instruction that should be given in the schools.

Early in November, after the instructors had become fairly acquainted with their several sections, I requested them to hand in each a list of sixteen of their poorest students. Examining these thirty-two names, I found that one was a student who had been admitted under condition in September, the second had barely

passed the entrance-examination. The remaining thirty had been admitted on certificate or diploma.

It having been thus made strikingly manifest that "certified" students were out of all proportion inferior to "examined" students, I determined to inquire into the school training itself. To this end I prepared ten questions, to be answered in writing by all Freshmen taking English. These questions touched upon their preparation in grammar and spelling, in composition and rhetoric, and in reading the prescribed English works. A copy of these questions is printed at the end of this article.

They were answered by 179 students. The number would have been larger, probably 200, but for numerous absences incident to the presidential election. I have read these 179 papers entire and have taken full notes of their contents. Fatiguing as the reading might be, it was anything but time wasted. It gave me an insight into school-methods that could not have been gained in any other way.

One general conclusion can be safely drawn from the papers before me. It is that the schools, taken collectively, do not exhibit any *uniformity* in their English instruction. Putting half a dozen of the best by themselves, it may be said of all the others that they differ widely in quantity of work done, in quality, and in their estimate of the ultimate object of the instruction.

The question which drew forth the greatest diversity of answer was No. 4. The answers range from "all read" to "none." It appears to be not merely a possibility but a regular practice in many certified schools (and schools preparing for the Regents' examination) to dispense altogether with English reading as a required study. Thus one student states:

"My Regents' diploma did not require me to read these books, but I have read Julius Caesar, Miles Standish, Webster's First Bunker Hill, and part of House of Seven Gables." In reply to No. 5 he continues: "I read the books mentioned above merely for the substance and for the pleasure I could get out of them, and did not make them a study so, of course, they were not explained to me or discussed by me and I never made them the subject of a written exercise." In reply to No. 7 he writes: "During the three years of my preparation at — Academy all academic students were obliged to write three essays a year. They were at least 250 words in

length." To No. 9 he replies: "I studied no text-book of Rhetoric except a few hours when I prepared for the examination in English composition." To No. 10: "The — Academy employs an excellent teacher of English. The morning hours from 9 to 10 every morning are devoted to the study of English composition, American Literature, and English reading, but this work was not compulsory with me, and being hard pressed for time I did not take it."

Another student replies to No. 4: "I read none of them in preparation but I have read the following: . . . The reading was done by myself, and, consequently, there were no written exercises nor discussions". To No. 10: "In such a school as I have attended, the teachers change so often that the courses are not fixed."

Another one writes: "There was a course of English Reading in the school which I was not able to attend on account of other necessary work." Still another (one of the best) says: "I had no class work in this [reading]—I had no regular instruction in English Composition and what work I did, I did by myself—I never entered the class but did my work outside, as I could not arrange my other studies so as to have the time for the class hours."

"Still another: "As I was admitted on Regents Certificate, I read none of the books in *direct preparation* for college. I had no preparation of the kind suggested in the question."

Another: "In the last two years, owing in great part to a change of teachers, less stress was put upon the work. This accounts for my having read but one of the works named."

Another: "I simply read these books by myself a very short time before the examination and had no help of any kind."

Finally: "I read none of these as a direct preparation for college. This is due to the fact that my entrance requirements were made up for by Regents Credentials."

Perhaps if the *ideal* of preparation had been lived up to, the *word* might have been mangled less frequently.

The answers to question No. 6 are usually in the affirmative. But occasionally there is a negative. Thus, of two papers (from the same school) one says simply, No; the other, "It depended upon the grammar grade the student was in." A third student writes: "I never studied it but with knowledge of Rhetoric I

succeeded in passing the Regents Ex." To No. 7 he writes: "In — School it was thirteen weeks work an hour each day. At —, school it was not taken up in school." To No. 9: "I think—Rhetoric. Mostly oral work."

The answers to No. 7 exhibit great diversity and weakness. See paper VI, quoted entire. Another student writes: "It was every day (40 m. recitation) 2 terms one year except S. And our essays were 600—700 words."

It would be impossible to tabulate the answers to No. 7. For this the schools themselves are in great measure responsible. They represent extremes. Some schools spread the instruction in composition over the entire course, giving a moderate amount each week. Others, again, seem to concentrate all the composition-work in one year. These latter, I fear, treat the subject as one to be disposed of and laid aside. But of all the schools, except a very few, it would be perfectly safe to say that the aggregate amount of work is quite inadequate.

The answers to No. 9 are confusing. The question was intended to be a supplement to questions 6, 7, 8. But very many students write as if Rhetoric were an entirely distinct subject from Composition, something to be studied on its own merits and without regard to their writing. This conception is inevitable, one may say, in a school that disposes of Rhetoric in a term or two, by recitation only or mainly. I may add that the system of Regents' examinations is also to blame. By its arrangement it *seems* at least to draw a line of separation between Composition and Rhetoric.

The answers to questions 2 and 3 are all affirmative. At least I do not remember any paper, the writer of which fails to assert that he was taught both spelling and grammar, either in the high school or before entering it. Unfortunately the answers themselves do not corroborate the assertion, *e. g.* "Yes. Received instruction in etymology, syntax and general work in—grammar for two terms." Another: "During the four years I had no instruction in English grammar. I was instructed previous to this time in English grammar." Another in reply to No. 9: "I studied a rhetoric text-book for Thirty Weeks, of which a good share of the time was spent in studying poetry, also Metaphors, Anthitheses, Hyperobles, Similies, and other various kinds of sentences. We spent some time in Purity—Force & Precision."

Another : "During my time at the high school (three years) I studded some grammar and also studded—Rhetoric. I was taught elementary grammar in all the elementary grades of the schools which I attended." Fortified by this assurance we shall find little difficulty in believing that in this school he "wrote on most all subjects practicable to give to High School pupils."

In general I may say that careless spelling is found in more than half the papers ; positively bad spelling in about one-third. But perhaps I underestimate.

Mistakes of grammar are not often of the worse sort. Usually they are blunders due to heedlessness, although occasionally they must be due to ignorance. The following, which appears quite out of keeping with an otherwise good paper, may serve for a sample : "The students of the department were divided into three sections, each of these sections were to write essays once in three weeks."

Question 8 elicited the most remarkable replies. Thus one writes : "Students usually chose their own subjects, *e. g.* Bees ; The last Time I Went Fishing, etc." It is not surprising that this writer, in reply to questions 4 and 5, should state : "Translation into English of four books of Caesar. No written exercises." But he is not the only one of the present set that has confounded Shakespeare and the Roman original. Another says bluntly : "The subjects upon which we wrote also depended upon the student. We could write about anything from 'How I Spent My Vacation', to 'The Rings of Saturn.'" One man succeeded in putting together "The Rec of the Hesperous." Another says : "They were chiefly argumentative, or on some current topic of interest. The U. S. Signal Service Bureau—Temperance vs. Total Abstinence—Our Late Troubles with Chili—Fairies—Rats—etc." I do not believe that the answer was intended for an anti-climax.

There is one general class of subjects to which I must call attention ; they violate the spirit of our public school system. Our schools at least should be exempt from the clash of party strife. Yet my students tell me that at school they were asked to write upon : "Why I Am a Republican ;" "The Bullet and the Ballot ;" "Why I Am a Democrat ;" "My Impressions of Harrison ;" "Grover Cleveland and Republican Creed ;" "Protection or Free Trade ;" "Comparison Between the Republican and Democratic Parties."



The answers to question 10 were in the main not clear. Evidently many of the writers were not accustomed to summing up the operations of a study running through more than one year, and their memories failed them. This inability betrays, I think, a defect in the training itself. The same writers would have done better if asked to recapitulate their course in Latin or in Mathematics. The answers to the second clause of the question: "How much time and attention did English receive in comparison with other subjects?" were in three groups. One group maintained that English got fully as much attention as any other study, and *justified* the assertion by the superior quality of the papers. Another group took the same ground, but belied the assertion by writing extremely poor papers. The third group, the great majority of the class, was either non-committal or inclined to the view that English did not get an equal share of attention.

To the last clause of No. 10 very few gave satisfactory answers. Many gave no answer at all. Some stated that occasionally a fault in spelling (but not in expression) had been corrected in written exercises in other subjects. Only a very few were able to give the assurance that their general school work had been thoroughly corrected for poor English.

From the more favorable answers I quote these: "All of our examination papers were marked for spelling, punctuation, etc., and very strictly. Special emphasis being laid upon correctness of statement according to rules of grammar. I did not prepare directly for college, only had a general education." Another: "All written work of any kind was corrected for faults of spelling and expression." A third: "Our written exercises in all studies were corrected for faults of spelling and expression." This third writer was doubtless much helped by the correction, for his general course in composition and rhetoric was short in time and quantity.

The general impression that these 179 papers must make upon a thoughtful reader is one of discouragement. This discouragement springs, not so much from the mistakes that offend the eye on page after page,—one learns to be resigned to mistakes in the young,—as from the startling uncouthness that besets the writers at every turn. They, that is the great majority of them, seem to be helpless. Pen, pencil, and paper seem to act upon them like an evil spell, putting to flight their ideas and even their know-

ledge. They comport themselves as raw recruits, unable to keep head, chest, arms, and legs in harmony. This uncouthness betrays itself at once in the penmanship. To one who is not dealing with large masses of papers, penmanship may seem of trifling importance. But the initiated know better. Crabbed, illegible handwriting multiplied by the hundred becomes an intolerable burden to the college examiner. It wastes his time and distracts his mind from the real subject. One hears occasionally the paradox that much training with the pen produces mechanical uniformity and destroys individuality of writing. Certainly these 179 papers are a protest against any such absurdity. Among them are some extremely well penned. And these are all *decidedly individualized*. Not one of them could possibly be mistaken for any other. Whereas papers of the mediocre sort display a strong family likeness. The worst papers arrange themselves in three well defined groups. In one, the letters are big, angular, and sprawling. They are the so-called school-boy-hand, or the mechanic's hand, and look as if the writer were more accustomed to handle the plough or saw than the pen. In the second, the letters are small and pinched and huddled together, there are few rounded strokes, and the whole page is blurred or smutted. In the third, the writing is marred by a constant whirl of the pen or pencil, that loops all the short letters together and makes *a* and *o* look alike, *u* and *n*, *w* and *m*. The effect upon the eye is bewildering. In some papers the writing is *atrocious*. To offer such papers as part of a college course is a libel upon education. One of my instructors informs me that one of his students (admitted last September upon school-certificate) was so awkward with the pen that he apparently printed each letter slowly and laboriously, as the tyro writes his exercises in Greek. Yet this student, I am satisfied, is naturally bright. Under careful training he would take his place among the very good. But, may I ask, why was not this training given him at school? Is a great University the place where one learns his alphabet?

In estimating these papers as a whole, one circumstance is not to be overlooked. They were written after the writers had had six or seven weeks of the strictest University training in this particular discipline. Every writer had already handed in two weekly papers and had been corrected for faults in them. He had also been made to understand that First English at Cornell

meant hard work, and that his remaining in the class might depend upon this term's performances. The instructors assure me that these papers exhibit a decided *improvement* during the six weeks. If that be so, the point of departure for the majority of the class must indeed be down in the depths.

It is noteworthy that in many papers the writer tries to excuse his deficiency in school training on the ground that his preparatory course was less than four years and that therefore he had other more important work to do. How an examination so-called may be passed, will appear from the following statement: "I was preparing for the course in Mechanical Engineering and did not graduate from the Academy.—Composition was one of the things studied. I passed an examination in it by reading it a couple of days before but did not know very much about the subject. English received very little attention compared with Latin, Greek and Mathematics. The course was for three years and consequently they occupied most of our time. Little attention was paid to the spelling of English in our examination papers." The writer is not from a New York school. But this one is: "English was quite thoroughly taught, nearly as much as any other subjects. The work was very difficult for me as compared with mathematics and received as little attention as would pass regents examination."

The following statement I should hesitate to communicate, if it proceeded from a poor student. But it comes from one of the best in the class and yet refers to an undoubtedly good school. It runs thus: "As a whole English did not probably receive as much attention as the other branches, for there was more chance for shirking the work and although it was the aim of the school to have this a strong department, it was not so thorough by quite a good deal as the other branches of study."

One general conclusion may be drawn from these 179 papers. Or rather, one general conviction forces itself upon the reader. It is that our present system of admission on certificate or on Regents' diploma should be abolished for English. The document, as document, is no guarantee that the candidate has had any definite or regular amount of training or that his training has been of the right kind. As matters now stand, admission on certificate practically means receiving into our classes and courses numbers of young persons who are unable to write a tolerable paper on any subject.

The question naturally arises: How may the evil be remedied? Of course Cornell can and doubtless will protect herself. But this is not enough. It leaves untouched the wider and infinitely graver problem of the relation of the high schools to the public at large. Not more than ten per cent. of our high school graduates pursue any more advanced course of study, any at least in which English is required. What becomes of the nine-tenths, the great mass of our so-called educated men and women? Can the English revealed in these papers be accepted as the writing ability of the state at large? The question that I would lay to the very heart of every school, of every person connected with the school, be he Regent, commissioner, teacher, or parent, is this: Does the school that graduates its pupils without the ability to spell, punctuate, form grammatical sentences and coherent paragraphs, and use words correctly, does that school do its duty by the State? I say, No! Whatever else the school may accomplish or neglect, its duty first, last, and every time, is to make its pupils *write*. Writing is the badge of education. Without the gift of communicating one's knowledge and thoughts in readable shape, one is little better than the skilled mechanic or routined shopkeeper. Writing is an unavoidable part of life. We all have to write letters of friendship or of business, we have to make reports to our superiors, we are continually called upon to state in public what we know or believe. An overwhelming majority of our high-school graduates never become mathematicians, classical students, historians, or scientists. Of what use to them in after life is the Latin, or history, or mathematics, if they are unable to write a good letter or prepare a good business report? Certainly we can not look upon them as representative men and women, when we see them toiling painfully with pen and ink, tripping over spelling, blundering down the page, unable to keep to the point and avoid wearisome repetition.

The schools have the remedy in their hands, but they fail to see it. Like most genuine remedies it is quite simple. Perhaps it has been overlooked or misapprehended precisely because it is simple. Were it more complex or more mysterious, it might succeed better in commanding regard. The remedy consists, to put it in a short phrase, in *changing school English from a study into an art*. Writing is an art, like drawing. It is not to be learned from text-books, but it is to be mastered through incessant practice.

sant and long continued practice. Any text-books we may use, whether we call them grammars or rhetorics, can never be more than secondary. The real work will always consist in *writing and getting correction in writing*. The text-book should play the same part in English composition that the manual of perspective or of color plays in the artist's studio. Do we ever see the artist painting from his manual? He is familiar with its general principles and occasionally consults it. But does he draw and paint, manual in hand? For one hour of book-work, study so-called, the artist has a thousand of manipulation.

I do not hold, of course, that painting and writing are parallel at all points. I merely contend that both are arts and therefore in both practice is primary, theory only secondary. In the main it is wise to give our high school pupils some formal instruction in rhetoric. The technical terms are convenient and well worth learning. Still more valuable is the insight that one gets thereby into the systematic treatment of written expression as a whole. The pupil should learn that there is a distinction between Style and Invention, that there are Figures of Speech, that Style has certain general properties, such as Clearness, Force, Purity. A moderate amount of this kind of study will be helpful and is in fact indispensable in a thorough English course. Only it should be strictly subordinate to the chief end, and that chief end is *to have something to say and to say it*. Whether the pupil says his say well or ill, will depend upon the *number of times* he is called upon to express himself and upon the *correction* he receives. Writing is not essentially different from tennis-play, or from violin-play. They are all arts of expression, and the artist's certainty and ease of movement proceed from his practice. Our great tennis-players begin as mere boys, barely able to wield the racket. They play unflinchingly for hours every day from early spring to late fall. No sooner does the tyro make a blunder than he is *corrected* for it, that is, it is turned against him by a more skillful adversary. So he progresses year by year until he ceases to be a tyro and begins to win. Perhaps he heads the college-tournament, perhaps even achieves distinction at the Newport All-Comers'. Our great players are, almost to a man, collegians, either under-graduates or very recent graduates. I bear no ill-will to lawn-tennis. On the contrary I look upon it as the most enjoyable and profitable game of our times. But, would it be

disrespectful of me to ask why English writing may not be learned in the same way and with like success? I fail to detect anything that should prevent the boy from beginning to write as soon as he can wield the pen, from writing every day, from getting all the correction that he needs, thoroughly and on the spot, from continuing to write until he is eighteen or nineteen, before he presents himself to the college public as an aspirant for college distinction.

Let us keep our heads clear and our judgments firm. When we pay money to see an athletic match, we expect something good. If the advertised match turns out to be only an encounter of boobies, we express freely our disgust and demand back our money. In our *sport*, then, we are inexorable. It is only in the *serious* arts of life that we are good-naturedly indifferent.

A deduction from the principle that English is an art is that it is indivisible. We can not break it up into spelling, grammar, composition, and rhetoric, treating them as independent studies. They are not, in strictness, studies at all; they are merely different phases of the general treatment of artistic expression, as lines, shadows, and perspective make up drawing. To write well, one must retain and increase his facility in every direction. From the tenth to the eighteenth year, at the earliest, the scholar should be made to understand that every exercise in writing is a review of first principles, that nothing is thoroughly mastered and ready to be laid by on the shelf. Yet I fear that our system of school and Regents' examinations has a tendency at least to encourage just this error.

Thus one Freshman writes: "I studied English grammar, and Rhetoric also passed Regents examination in English composition.—I passed the Regents examination in spelling—My instruction in Grammar and Rhetoric were a part of my course but I took the exam. in English Composition without preparation.—I took Rhetoric instead of English composition but as the first part was used in Composition it amounted to the same thing.—My text book in Rhetoric was a standard work it included Figures of Speech, Clearness Force etc Composition and Scanning.—My course in English I think covered a good deal of ground. My Rhetoric took about an hour a day, a time equal to that of any other study.—My Rhetoric extended over two terms." Not many papers are as miserably self-complacent as this. Nevertheless



one detects all along the line a lurking disposition to regard an examination as ending one or another part of the subject.

A second and equally serious fault in the school system is the drawing of a sharp dividing line between the course in Composition-Rhetoric and the course in Literature, and treating the Literature as non-essential for graduation. I have not kept the statistics on this point, but I can safely guess that one-third of the 179 writers admit that they read none of the prescribed books, or at most one or two, in fact that they had no literary training in school, for the all-sufficient reason that it was not required in their course and they were admitted on school or Regents' certificate. An apter exemplification could scarcely be offered of the old adage: Penny wise and pound foolish. To save time, to get through school, to get into college, at any cost, scholars are permitted, even encouraged to disregard the surest means of general training!

On this point no Cornell professor, I believe, has any illusions. The Freshmen instructors make one standing complaint: our students have no vocabulary. If we give them a word outside of newspaper English or "shop," they are in a daze. They appear unable to vary a thought or idea for lack of a word to express the shade of meaning. They write the same phrases over and over, until our patience is exhausted.

This is not surprising. How is the ordinary high school pupil to acquire even an inkling of the richness of our English vocabulary, to get any insight whatever into shades of meaning, except through a course of school-reading? We Americans are not a reading folk, New York is not a reading state by eminence. Comparatively few of our families outside the pale of the great cities possess home libraries or inherit a taste for literature. We devour enormous quantities of newspapers, magazines, and dime novels. But in genuine reading of a higher order we lag behind England, Germany, France, and even Italy. This is one of the open secrets of the American book-trade. Our book publishers tell us that it is impossible to "place" books of a certain kind. Whoever wishes to test the point need only compare the American annual book-list with that of any great European nation. Can we imagine America getting out such a catalogue as that of Hinrichs?

If we seek an explanation we need go no farther than our

schools. Instead of trying to plant and foster in the minds of the young a taste for good reading, we seem to do all we can to divert them from it. We invent technical and classical courses without English, thereby ignoring the fact that precisely these students are most in need of it. Were our classical students really students of Greek and Roman *literature*, able to appreciate in a measure their Iliad and Aeneid as finished literary expressions of the ripest thought, one might perhaps waive the claims of such *inferior* mortals as Shakespeare and Milton. But everyone knows that the school course in the so-called classics, begun years too late, is nothing but a frantic effort to master paradigms and rules of syntax. The scholar has no prospect of getting beyond grammar and dictionary. The chances are ten to one that for the ordinary undergraduate at matriculation all printed matter is mere grist for the grammar-mill.

As for the technical students, I prudently refrain from uttering the whole truth. Suffer me to put merely this question: Have my readers ever considered the great danger to *all* education in letting thousands of young men grow up in the conceit that they are educated if only they have some mathematics and a smattering of science and are able to run a steam-engine or a dynamo? Of the things of the spirit, those things that make man truly man, our technical students, the great mass of them certainly, are ignorant and reckless. They are crass materialists.

For all these evils I see only one remedy. That is, to require a full course of English reading in every high school and academy, a course generous in amount and high in quality. This course should be combined with the course in composition and rhetoric and under the direction of the same teacher. Whether the teacher of composition be head and the teacher of reading be assistant, or vice versa, is immaterial, if only the two lines of work are in perfect accord and mutually helpful. The present dissociation of writing and reading is, in my judgment, unwise and wholly unjustifiable. How is the scholar to learn to write, unless he is taught to recognize and appreciate the thought and diction of the great men before him. On the other hand, mere reading without writing is, I might say, a study without an aim. To make reading truly practical, the scholar should learn to test his strength by that of his models, should learn to paraphrase and re-state them, should learn to use their words and phrases, in

short should do everything but servilely imitate their sentence-structure. Even downright imitation would not be very harmful. In the light of these 179 papers, I could gladly welcome even the worst mannerisms of Macaulay and Carlyle. Anything would be a relief from our present chaos.

An English course in the high school, to satisfy the needs of the situation, should consist of at least three hours a week throughout the four years. It should include the careful reading of all the works on the prescribed list and as many more. Every work should be studied at home and explained in class and made the subject of at least a dozen written exercises. The meaning and the spelling of words, even of proper names, should be rigidly enforced. The spelling to be constantly tested in *writing*; oral spelling is not enough, the mind must form an image of the word in its written shape. Parallel with this reading should run the mere formal instruction in rhetoric, much smaller in amount but rigorous in method. Let rules and definitions be few in number, but let them be mastered as accurately as the Latin declensions. And let them all be illustrated copiously and enforced in practice. Lastly, whatever text-book of rhetoric be used, let it be in constant use throughout the four years. Let it be used in every reading lesson as a commentary on the text. It has always seemed to me a self-evident truth that the chief utility of rhetorical study lies in its application to the style of the authors one reads, rather than to one's own style. By applying our text-book of rhetoric to a few well chosen authors, we may perhaps learn that its principles are after all only deductions from them, or their like, and not mere a priori formulas.

To show how reading and writing can be made and are made to go hand in hand, I quote from one of these papers the answer to question 8: "One essay was written on the whole work, then minor subjects throughout the whole book were selected by the teacher to write upon. (The writer had previously stated that all nine works were read and that for each work there were not less than six essays). *Evangeline*—The Evening at the Farmhouse—The Landing of the English—Embarkment and Landing of the Fugitives—The Trip Down the River—Life in the Missionary Camp—The Ruined Hut—Sisters of Charity and Meeting of the Lovers.—*Silas Marner*—His Life at Lantern Yard—His Life (at Raveloe?) and How the People Regarded Him—The

Lost Gold—Coming of Eppie—Godfrey Cass and his Wife—The Horse Race—Eppie in Love—Finding of the Gold.—I name these subjects of the two books to illustrate the way we studied every book piece by piece."

The writer is not in a literary course, perhaps he has taken his last look at literary study. But in after life he ought to be grateful to his school for having made him read at least nine good English books "piece by piece." Assuredly our English department appreciates the service rendered. One advantage, not the least, of such a conjunction of reading and writing is that it yields an unfailing supply of subjects. Here can be no lack of things to write about, no need of narrating a "Voyage to the Sun" or "The Whisperings of an Old Shoe," no room for those absurd appeals to the undeveloped imagination that turn composition-hour into a nightmare. The young scholar learns in a practical way the practical secret that to *write well* one need only pay attention, remember accurately, and state one's impressions and recollections in an orderly manner. All this is far from making an *author*. But is it the function of the school to evolve authors? Why then torture youth into futile efforts at romancing?

Before passing to the final point in these remarks, let me urge upon English teachers the necessity of correcting their essays and compositions more thoroughly. The 179 papers before me betray carelessness, even where there is nothing positively wrong. Commas and even periods are omitted, also the possessive sign. Words are improperly broken at the line-end. The writers begin a new line or sentence at random. These things are minutiae, it is true, straws; but they are straws that show which way the wind blows. They are the conventionalisms of writing, and—like other conventionalisms—have their indefeasible value. To ignore them is to proclaim oneself deficient in good *breeding*. Like shoe-strings untied, collars unbuttoned, they offend the eye. I see no reason why every school composition should not be read as if for "proof." Were I a teacher in school I should not hesitate to print occasionally a very careless paper verbatim et literatim and thus show the writer and his classmates what is involved in the neglect of conventional signs. Thorough correction is the only means of training the eye and hand and brain to work together. There are students in this university who are unable to copy correctly what is set before them! In proof of this I need

only ask the reader to note the number of times the spelling "preperation" occurs in these quotations; also "preparatory." Yet preparatory" was spelled correctly once for the writers in the paper of questions, and "preparation" twice; the mimeograph impression was perfectly clear.

Blundering of this sort is heinous. But is it surprising? Have the writers ever been trained to *look at* a word? If so, how does it happen that they write of Heart's Rhetoric, or Quackenbush's. To the indifferent everything is possible. But schools are not for the encouragement of indifference; rather for its eradication. Shall we never live up to the truth that the eye is to be trained to see the signs of speech no less than the figures of geometry?

The last suggestion that I would make is that every scholar be required to write at least every fortnight a short paper in every study pursued by him in the school. The advantages on all sides of such exercises are so obvious that I can only wonder at their not having been introduced long ago. To begin with, they would constitute a most effective method of instruction. In what other way is it possible, for instance, to acquire ease and precision in translating from a foreign language, ancient or modern? The translation papers of our college students everywhere exhibit the most deplorable inability to render a foreign speech into the mother idiom. Why should not the practice of written translation be begun in school? As much gain, or almost as much, may be claimed for written papers in geography, history, and science. Oral recitations do not test the scholar's knowledge as thoroughly, nor do they give any training for term and final examination. Moreover, a fortnightly review in writing would help, more than anything else perhaps, to break up the practice of "cramming" for examination.

But over and above the gain in the studies proper, the gain in English would be immense. Were all the teachers of a school to co-operate in some such way, they would force every scholar to write upon some subject every day. At the end of four years the scholar would inevitably look upon writing as a matter of course, as part of his daily routine. That is precisely the end that I have in view. I shall consider the great question as settled when our high school pupils take to their paper and pen as the natural and obvious means of stating what they know and

believe. For that is the utmost that we can *require* of any one. But so long as writing and correction are left to one department, as now, just so long will the scholar be confirmed in his present delusion that good and ready writing is the concern of the English department alone and has no practical value for any other subject.

To sum up these remarks in a single phrase: It is the duty of the High School to meet this great question *viribus unitis*. The obligation rests upon every teacher. None are exempt.

A few words in explanation of the following papers. They are reproduced as exactly as type can make them. But no type could give an idea of the bad penmanship, especially of papers I, VII, IX. Papers II and X, on the other hand, are very neat and clear.

The letters *C* and *R* = admitted on Certificate of school, or on Regents' diploma.

Papers I and II come from the same Western school. The writer of II is, to my personal knowledge, member of an educated family; the writer of I is probably not. I have contrasted the two in order to show how little the *school* has accomplished in the matter.

Paper III reveals what is *not* done in a "finishing" year at a great Eastern training school. Paper X speaks decisively of what *can* be accomplished at school.

#### QUESTIONS.

1. What school or schools did you attend during the four years immediately preceding your admission to Cornell? If you did not attend any school, name the person or persons that prepared you.

2. Did you receive during those four years any instruction in English grammar? If so, what was its nature? Were you taught English grammar at any previous time?

3. Was your ability to spell correctly tested by means of written exercises?

4. Which of the following books were read by you in direct preparation for college: Julius Caesar; As You Like It; Mar-mion; Courtship of Miles Standish; Sir Roger de Coverley Papers; Macaulay's Essay on Chatham; Webster's First Bunker Hill Oration; Alhambra; Talisman; Scenes from Clerical Life; House of Seven Gables?

5. Explain the nature of your preparation in the above works, or in similar works read by you for the same purpose. Especially



state whether each work was read entire, was explained or discussed in class, was made the subject of written exercises. Were such exercises returned by the teacher with corrections?

6. Was your instruction in English composition a regular part of the school curriculum, enforced and graded like other studies; like, e. g. Latin, or Mathematics?

7. How much time was spent in your school (or by your instructor) in English composition? State the number of years, and of hours per week. Also the length in words, approximately, of each written exercise.

8. State, as well as you can remember, the kinds of subject on which you wrote. Give two or three titles.

9. Did you study any text-book of Rhetoric? What was the nature of the instruction?

10. State any other facts that may aid this department in forming an estimate of the work *actually done* in preparatory schools in English. How much time and attention did English receive in comparison with other subjects? Were your written exercises or examination papers in Mathematics, Latin, History, etc., corrected for faults of spelling and expression?

I.—C.

1. I took a three years course in the — Manual Training School, previous to entering Cornell, before taking my course in the — M. T. S. I graduated from one of the grammar schools of that city.

2. I studied english grammar for almost a year, in, my first year at the training school, I also studied it at the grammar school.

The first half of the year we studied the grammar principally, and the last half we read a novel and explained the reasons for the different constructions.

We also wrote one essay every month during the first two years.

3. As am a fair speller judging from my written exercises and when I studied spelling in the grammar schools, it used to be one of my best studies.

4. I read no book in direct preparation for college, but in the grammar schools we read *Courtship of Miles Standish*, *Snow Bound*, and *Evangeline*.

5. We read the books just mentioned in class, We finished each of them and had an examination in each subject.

In studying these subjects we use to see if any mistakes were made in the grammatical construction, also if the sentence could not be worded better.

We also picked out different figures of speech, and then we would give original examples of them.

About twice a week we had written exercises of this kind which we handed in, and which were returned by the teacher marked and corrected.

6. In the — training school our essays counted a tenth of our scholarship mark, and was considered as important as any other study.

if the essays were not handed in at a certain time we were not allowed to come to recitation till we had handed it in.

7. In the training school we spent about five or six hours on each essay, and we had in class work a half hour recitation each day the first year, and we were supposed to spend an hour and a half in preparation on each lesson.

Each written exercise we handed in was usually the answers to ten short questions, or else some short essay, on some subject, which was sometimes given by the instructor, and sometimes we had our own choice of subjects.

8. I don't remember any subjects we wrote on in class, but the subjects of some of our essays were, *The Dictionary*, *Clouds*, and *How I spent my vacation*.

9. I never studied any text-book of Rhetoric, in fact in the training school we had no regular text-book in English, but the rules we were to follow were given us by the instructor, and those that we obtained from books in the library.

## II.—C.

1. Before coming to Cornell I took a course of three years at the — Manual Training School, the year preceeding I spent at a small private school in —, the teacher was from Boston and a graduate of the Normal School at that place.

2. I did not study English grammar at that time or previously but I have studied Latin grammar.

3. In the private school mentioned above we had written exercises in spelling two or three times each week. A lady in— invited a number of boys to her house every Saturday evening for one whole winter to had a spelling-match, the evenings were very enjoyable and I think the boys gained by them.

4. I did not read any of the books mentioned as direct preparation for Cornell as I entered on certificate, but I have read at other times *Julius Caesar*; *As You Like It*; *Courtship of Miles Standish* and *Webster's First Bunker Hill Oration*.

5. The above works were read out of school. I have not had written exercises on any literary work.

6. At the — Manual Training School regular essays were required and marked.

7. An essay was required each month to be at least three pages of fool's-cap paper in length.

8. The subjects of essays were largely technical in their nature as "*The Oak*"; "*Cast Iron*"; "*Description of a Dynamo.*"

9. I have never studied Rhetoric until this year.

10. My examination papers have always been corrected in spelling but not in form of expression. During my whole time of preparation I have written essays more or less frequently. At

graduation from the Manual Training School I wrote an essay of some length upon Aluminum telling of its uses, manufacture and properties chemical and physical. In traveling I have usually kept a diary describing scenes and localities visited. It has always been difficult for me to express myself clearly and concisely in writing.

III.—R.

1. I attended the — High School three years, and one year at — Academy.
2. No, we had no English grammar during these four years. I was taught English grammar before this time.
3. It was tested by means of written exercises.
4. Marmion. The Talisman.
5. Read both books through. They were discussed in class. Wrote an exercise on The Talisman, it was returned with corrections.
6. He was at [ — Academy ], but not at [ High School ].
7. One year, two hours a week. We had no written exercises to speak of.
8. Had no written exercises to speak of.
9. Wrote a text-book of Rhetoric at High School, no written exercises.
10. The work spent in English did not receive as much attention as other subjects. Our examination papers in other subjects were not corrected for the faults named.

IV.—C.

1. During the last two years previous to entrance I attended the — School in — The year before that the — Military Academy — Did not attend school the year before going to M. A.
2. I have not received any instruction in English grammar during the past four years I studied English grammar in the public schools Six or Seven years ago.
3. My ability to spell was tested by written exercises in the public schools—not since then—
4. I read all of these books except, the House of Seven Gables—
5. Each book was read entire and was made the subject of written exercises, one—two and sometimes three compositions being required on the same book or on different parts of it. The exercises were corrected by the teacher and handed back to us, we were marked for the exercises the same as for any other study.
6. I am not sure as to this, it may have been a part of the school curriculum, but, having so much other work I never studied it in the school—
7. I cannot answer this question as I do not know. I believe there were classes in English grammar and composition but I never attended any of them—

8. Same as question seven—

9. I never studded any Text book of rhetoric—

10. It appears to me that little or no attention was paid to English composition in any of the schools I ever attended—at least as compared with other studdies.

I never remember of having examination papers corrected for spelling—certainly miss-pelled [*thus broken in original*] words did not count against the examination mark—

About all the work I ever had in English composition was upon the books required to be read for entrance—This preparation was very thorough but did not go very far and only took about three months—

#### V.—C.

1. The — Academy.

2. My course in English grammar was completed to first two years or better in the 1st & 2d year classes leaving the other 4 open to higher grades of inglish. From Easter 92 up to the Cornell U examinations studied English Grammar one hour each day.

3. Yes.

4. I Julius Caesar and As you like it.

5. The books named above with several of G Eliots & part of Vanity Fair was carefully lead by me during the summer.

6. English composition was a regular part of the school curriculum, but hardly thought of as much & Math. or Latin during the last 4 years of instruction.

7. Eight compositions of between 800 & 1000 words were prepared during the year. these were corrected in presence of the student.

8. The Camp on Lake Champlain. Queen Elizabeth.

9. No.

10. English received the same amount of time as other subjects. The papers were corrected in regards spelling, but never remember having an exspression corrected.

#### VI.—R.

1. — Union and Classical School under the supervision of the Regents.

2. I finished my english grammar about six years ago; but have since studded Eng. composition and some Rhetoric.

3. It was about seven or eight years ago, at which time I passed the regents examination.

4. Julius Caesar. Websters First Bunker Hill Oration.

5. We simply read them, made an synopsis of the principle points, and committed them to memory.

6. It was, until after you passed the Regents.

7. One half hour per day except Saturday. Only had it one term, because I passed the exam. No written exercises.

8. None.

9. — Rhetoric. Did not have time for exercises, going through the book in about 10 weeks.
10. It received just as much attention as any study. I do not think they were or many would not have passed.

VII.—R.

1. Of the four years immediately preceding my admission to Cornell I attended a country school at — one year and the remaining three years at — Academy.
2. I received two years instruction in English grammar. The kind of work consisted of writing and correcting sentences, diagram and analyze sentences and write short compositions. I have not been English grammar at any previous time.
3. My ability to spell was tested by means of written extracts.
4. I have not read any of the books named directly for my preparation for college, however I have read Macaulay's Essay on Chatham and Webster's First Bunker Hill Oration.
5. I have not read any books for direct preparations in English composition.
6. My instruction in English composition was a regular part of the school curriculum, enforced and graded like other studies.
7. Three hours a week was spent in my school in English composition. I had English composition one year. The number of words in a composition was from three hundred to five hundred words.
8. Some of my subjects in composition are life of Caesar.

VIII.—R.

1. I attended the — Union School during the three years immediately preceding my entrance to Cornell and did the four years preparatory work in three years at that school.
2. I received instruction in English grammar during one year and a half of my preparatory study. The amount and nature of the instruction in English grammar which I have received was an amount necessary to pass the Regents examination of the State of New York in both elementary and advanced English grammar. I was instructed in English grammar for three years previous to my entrance to a preparatory school.
3. My ability to spell was tested by means of written exercises.
4. I have read none of the books given in question (4) in direct preparation for Cornell University but I have read all of these books in connection with a course in English reading which I took at a High School—
5. Each of these works was read entire and explained and discussed and exercises were held in the class in all of the books and the exercises were corrected and returned by the teacher.
6. My instruction in English Composition was a regular part of the school curriculum, graded and enforced like other studies, like e. g. Latin, or Mathematics.

7. I spent one half year on English composition having five hours per week, the length of the compositions were about 150 words as an approximate number.

8. In our composition we usually wrote on some period of the life of some statesman, or on objects of nature as The early life of Geore Washington, George Washingtons service in the French and Indian war, The Mammoth Trees of California—

9. In our instruction in Rhetoric we used—Rhetoric and took up thoroughly all those parts of the book except, those relating to versification and all that part of style except clearness and force.

10. Composition received the same amount of time as other subjects in my preparatory work.

#### IX.—C.

1.—Classical & Scientific School.—Academy.

2. I received instruction in English Grammar during my four yrs. preparatory to entering I was taught Grammar before the last four years.

3. I had written spelling every day of my last year. Every one in school was obliged to take it.

4. I read all the books mentioned, except that we read Webster's 2ed Bunker Hill Oration instead of first.

5. We read all the books and were examined once a week in one of the books. The examination was oral, every man (there being only 13) was called upon. & had to tell some part of the book. & give a quotation of at least 25 words. At the end of term took Regents examination.

6. Answered in (9) & (7).

7. The last year I had Rhetoric 12 wks,  $\frac{3}{4}$  hour a day & have studdied it three different terms of different years. In grammar class one hundred words were required each day & in Rhetoric 200 every other day.

8. In grammar such titles as trees noted places in town, etc. In Rhetoric such subjects as,

9. I used — Rhetoric also — Rhetoric. It was required in my course We had to write esseys every other day outside of class & they were corrected & handed back by instructor to next day. We also had to learn certain parts of the Rhetoric & correct certain sentences. This latter part was oral.

10. We took the Regents examinations I do not know how they mark.

To encourage students in Rhetoric and English composition a prize contest was held every commencement (any one could take part I never tried for the prize

#### X.—Exam.

1. I attended the—High School for about two years, and the —Boys' High School for the next two years.



2. I was taught grammar in the [*first*] H. S. in connection with composition for about six months. I have been taught grammar nearly as far back as I remember, receiving instruction in that subject for four years before I entered the High School.

3. Decidedly, yes.

4. As You Like It, Sir Roger de Coverly Papers, Macaulay's Essay on Chatham, Alhambra.

5. In the [*first*] High School we read a great many of the stories of Shakespeare as given by Lamb; we read Irving's Life of Washington; a book called "The Seven American Classics"; we read Burns's poems; etc. making abstracts and compositions in connection with the reading. In the [*second*] H. S. we read and studied Longfellow's poems, Whittier's poems, Holmes's poems, "Vicar of Wakefield," "The Merchant of Venice," and a few other works. We wrote abstracts and compositions which were rigorously marked. For instance, one was "The Development of Reuben's Character," as portrayed in "The Great Carbuncle," another "The Ten Most Important Scenes in the Merchant of Venice."

6. It was.

7. Five hours a week in English work in the [*second*] High School. I have forgotten the time in the [*first*] High School. I think it was five hours. In each school I had to write three compositions a term (six months). The exercises were graded in the [*second*] High School. First, was a descriptive composition of 100 to 150 words; next, narration, 150 to 200; next, formal argument, 200 to 250; next, narrative or descriptive poem; next, practical argument; then a book review and some others I have forgotten; and lastly a lyric poem of 500 words. In [*first*] H. S. we wrote compositions of from three hundred to five hundred words. These had to be learned and delivered in the assembly room.

8. Included in (7) "Death", "The Fall of Rome Was Inevitable", "Canada Should Be Annexed to the United States", "Harkness's Grammar", The Development of the Sin Caused by the Hoggarty Diamond and the Rajah's Diamond, as portrayed in Thackeray's "The Great Hogarty Diamond", and Stevenson's "The Rajah's Diamond."

9. I studied—Rhetoric. We had, I believe, two lessons a week. We took the exercises after the rules, studying how to correct mistakes in figures, force, clearness, etc.

10. Our English teacher, Prof. —, also taught us History, and he marked the History papers for form as well as for substance. Three per cent were deducted for every error in spelling. If you spelled the same word wrong 7 times, it counted off 21 per cent. I understood that one fellow was marked negative ten per cent. Form included punctuation, spelling, paragraphing, etc., and all our compositions in [*second*] H. S., were marked on

a basis of five for form and five for substance. English received comparatively as much attention as the other subjects. Those poems were the rankest work I ever had.

[Fate is sometimes ironical. The above paper, undoubtedly the best in technique, was selected on the assumption that the writer was admitted on certificate. But inspection of the record shows that he took the examinations.]

—J. M. Hart.

Cornell University.

### Book Department.

THE FOUNDATION OF RHETORIC. By Adams Sherman Hill. New York : Harper & Bros. 1892.

Professor A. S. Hill of Harvard is the author of one of the best Rhetorics published in this country, and it is therefore especially interesting to examine this new book from his pen. The *Foundation of Rhetoric* is intended as a more elementary work than the *Principles* by the same author, and it therefore deals with the simplest points of good usage in writing and speaking. In accordance with this plan about two-thirds of the book is devoted to the use of words, the remaining third being divided between sentences and paragraphs, the latter receiving but slight attention. Throughout are copious examples both of correct and incorrect forms, with concise discussions of the points involved. As an example of the minute points discussed, Professor Hill treats under nouns the possessive case, plurals that may be misused, and words in *ess* and *ist*. He apologizes for the past on possessives by saying, that "the faulty sentences come from compositions written by candidates for admission to Harvard College." But certainly all teachers of rhetoric will justify this careful discussion of minute points, since these are the ones in which mistakes are most frequently made. In fact the best thing about Professor Hill's book is its practical rather than its theoretical character. The book thus reaches down into the realm of grammar, instead of carrying us into the regions of philosophy.

One thing we should have been glad to see emphasized more than has been done. Rhetorics usually fail to take into account the difference between spoken and written English, between the colloquial and literary dialects so to speak. That there is such a difference, both in choice of words and to some extent in constructions, it seems to me useless to deny. For example take the use of *who* for *whom* in "who did you see?" Is it not best to recognize in this a correct colloquial use of *who*, since it is so thoroughly established, than to try the impossible in rooting out the usage? Even Professor Hill, according to his own theory, should have recognized this use, since he recommends the adop-

tion of English usage when also found in America (p. 28), and the above use of *who* is English usage according to Sweet's *Spoken English* (p. 20). The same may be said of the use of *me* in "It's me," for which see Sweet's *New English Grammar* (p. 341). The purist is too often accustomed to take into account only the usage of books, while there is also a standard usage among good speakers.

There is another principle as to difficult points of usage which may be illustrated by a story. A very cautious man was once asked, "Which would you say; the public *is* cordially invited, or the public *are* cordially invited?" His answer was "I should say; a cordial invitation is extended to the public." This of course seems like dodging a point that should be settled by some reason for one or the other form. In reality the answer was based on a fundamental principle of good form. Often times either of two forms would at least suggest something besides the meaning intended, and the principle of encouraging and concentrating the reader's attention may demand giving up both forms for a third which is always possible to choose. This principle might certainly be applied to some of the discussions in Professor Hill's book, while in the main they are admirable. For instance, ought it not to be said of the possessive singular of nouns ending in *s*, that while careful writers usually add the apostrophe and *s*, they also commonly avoid the occurrence of such a possessive for the sake of euphony.

Exception might be taken to some statements in the book. For example; (p. 82) "'You *was*,' which is now a badge of vulgarity, was once good English," for which Horace Walpole is cited as an authority. Certainly the authority of Horace Walpole is hardly sufficient to establish *you was* as good English at any time and it is doubtful whether the occasional example cited by Fitz-Edward Hall can do so. Again on p. 92 it says: "*Proven* is borrowed from the Scotch legal dialect. In the case of Madeline Smith, who was tried for murder in Edinburgh in 1857, the verdict of the jury was 'not proven.' Since that time the word has often appeared in newspapers, in magazines, and often in books." The implication here is that the word was borrowed after 1857, while a reference to Webster shows that it was used by Thackeray at least before this.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, The plan of Professor Hill's book is admirable, and its careful discussion of so many points of usage will be particularly valuable to teachers in secondary schools.

—Oliver Farrar Emerson.

THE STORY OF THE ILIAD. By the Rev. Prof. Alfred J. Church. Macmillan's School Library. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1892, pp. VI., 314.

Few writers of stories for the young have succeeded so well as Rev. A. J. Church in putting in popular form the masterpieces of Greek and Roman literature. He is not a translator but a storyteller with the rare ability of keeping to his text. *The Story of the Iliad* is one of his latest productions and one of the best. It is a revision of a part of the older volume, *Stories from Homer*, but as its title indicates the narrative is continuous and gives a complete sketch of the Iliad. The interpolations are so numerous and the verbal changes so frequent that the new edition is really a new book. It renders in simple English much of the fervor and dramatic spirit of the great epic, and it is sufficient praise to say that the author not only shows his readers the plains of Troy but induces with reality the misty legends of the place.

The chief interest for teachers in the appearance of the present volume is that it is the first issue of "Macmillan's School Library of Books for Supplementary Reading." The publishers announce that it will be followed by "such of their books for the young as have already by their popularity and recognized excellence acquired the right to rank as standard reading books." Yonge's *Book of Golden Deeds*, Kingsley's *Madam How and Lady Why*, and Palgrave's *Children's Treasury of English Song*, have closely followed the initial number of the series. They are well bound, printed on good paper and, with one exception, in large type.

The significance of such a series—offered now by most publishing houses—is an encouraging sign of the times. It is coming to be recognized that mere intellectual acumen is not the *summum bonum* of educational methods; there is a higher end and that end is *life*. The routine of school discipline is too often made an end in itself, and for the narrow school a book of indifferent selections may suffice for reading material. The school that aims to bring its pupils in contact with the higher life and the realities of life will demand such masterpieces from all literatures as will best serve to meet the requirements of growing minds to inspire them from the outset with a love for good reading. Publishers in issuing such series as Macmillan & Co. now offer, are doing much to advance right methods and in proportion as they place good reading within reach of all do they deserve recognition and support at the hands of school-men.

—James E. Russell.

THE REALM OF NATURE; AN OUTLINE OF PHYSIOGRAPHY. By Hugh Robert Mill, D.Sc. 336 pp. 19 colored maps and 68 diagrams. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.  
University Extension Manuals, edited by Professor Knight.

The author states this book to be "an outline of the more important facts regarding the structure of the Universe, the form,

material and processes of the earth and the relations which they bear to Life in its varied phases." This he calls Physiography which "is an account of physical science as a whole." It is unfortunate that the word Physiography is used here in this sense for there has been a tendency of late years among the best authorities to restrict the term and use it as the equivalent of Physical Geography; but with Thornton using it to cover astronomical relations of the earth, and Mill "as an account of physical science as a whole," one finds it difficult to decide just what Physiography really is.

In a work covering so vast a field as this which Dr. Mill has attempted to consider it is natural to look for much that is weak in the treatment; and this unfortunately is the case in this instance. There are few, if any, scientific men who are competent to cover the whole range of physical science, even in outline, in a satisfactory manner. Such an attempt is of necessity a compilation, in part, and a compilation in a rapidly progressing science by one unacquainted with the progress of the science, is bound to be in error for it cannot include the advance recorded in the current literature, but depends upon text-books which are apt to be in part antiquated.

That this is the case with the book under consideration is plainly seen in the part which deals with geology and which occupies nearly half the book. The author here followed Geikie's Text-Book of Geology, published in 1885, as is shown by his order of presentation and by many minor facts. Among other things he has adopted Geikie's classification of geological periods, in which the Palaeozoic formations are all classed together in the Primary with the Archaen, a classification for which there is no basis and which Geikie himself has abandoned in his latest work. The classification of mountains, also adapted from Geikie, is not scientific for it includes under one head, simply because they are reliefs, such diverse forms as volcanoes, mountains of elevation, and hills of denudation, although in both character and origin they are widely different. A mistake is made in the description of the Appalachian mountains which states that they are made up of a series of anticlinal ridges and synclinal valleys while, in general, the reverse is the case. It is stated also that fjords are usually ascribed to glacial erosion; but there are now very few glacialists who still hold this view.

No cognizance is taken of the work done by the American school of physical geography, which has made such advances in the last twenty years, and built up a new science of physical geography, treating the subject from the point of view of origin, history and development of land form, rather than the purely statistical and descriptive side which he still adheres to and which is properly a part of geography and not physical geography or physiography. Thus islands are spoken of, as of old, as belong-

ing to two classes, Continental and Oceanic, though why the mere proximity to land should serve as a basis for a classification is not apparent. How does the volcanic island of Stromboli differ from one of the Hawaiian islands? The case of the classification of mountains above referred to is also to the point.

The chief criticism to be made against this volume is that of brevity. It would be absolutely impossible in a book so small to cover the entire range of physical science in a manner at all satisfactory though it must be confessed that, considering the size of his book, the author has done remarkably well. Taking one or more scientific examples of this defect, reference may be made to the discussion of the geological action of animal and vegetable life which is not at all complete. The entire subject of the cause of lunar tides occupies but three-fourths of a page, and one unacquainted with the subject would find great difficulty in understanding from his description why there are two tides each day. The same criticism applies to his explanation of geysers and of other phenomena.

Many of the illustrations, particularly the colored maps compiled from Buchan, Wallace and others are excellent; but here also there are omissions. Curiously enough the cartographer has failed to mark Japan as a region of frequent earthquakes although there are few countries in the world where they are more frequent. On the same chart there is a failure to record the recent volcanoes of the western United States of which a number have been described. Several existing glaciers were described from the Sierra Nevada by Russell in 1885, but they are not marked upon the chart which is made to show the distribution of glaciers.

With the exception of the cross sections the diagrammatic illustrations are good. For some reason which does not appear, Dr. Mill has made the vertical scale of his sections three hundred times the horizontal. This immense vertical exaggeration has produced a thoroughly unnatural effect. Sometimes it is necessary to make the vertical scale greater than the horizontal but ordinarily the best result is obtained by the adoption of a natural scale, or at most a very slight exaggeration. One does not then have to mentally reduce the diagram from a series of nearly vertical lines and acute angles to the normal gentle slope and rounded summit.

The author's style is admirably clear and crisp but in reading the book the excessive conciseness is almost tiresome, and this is increased at times by the use of words and phrases which require some effort to translate. Examples of this are the two words, Hydrosphere and Lithosphere, very little used elsewhere, but which Dr. Mill constantly uses for ocean and the world's crust. There are other reasons than this why it is doubtful if it is well to attempt this substitute, chiefly that neither is a sphere as the names would imply.



The defects of this book have been thus fully dwelt upon, not because it is wholly bad, for there are many points worthy of the highest praise, but because the weak points are sufficiently numerous to seriously injure its value as a book of reference. Dr. Mill has attempted too much; and knowing the scope of the volume its weakness could have been predicted. Such a work could be produced satisfactorily only by a number of authors each writing upon his own specialty; but in this age of abundant and cheap text-books there is very little need of a book so general in range as this. If, however, one wishes to know a little of all the physical sciences, and is not able to procure a text-book upon each of the subjects he will find in this volume a fairly good substitute. The author shows a marked talent for lucid writing and as broad a knowledge as could be expected. He has tried to eliminate inaccuracies with much care; but in spite of all his efforts these have crept in as they must in all compilations of a physical science, unless done by specialists who alone are able to keep abreast of the times in a rapidly progressing science, carefully weigh the facts and properly present the progress of the science.

—Ralph S. Tarr.

AN ENGLISH GRAMMAR, adapted from "Essentials of English Grammar" by Professor W. D. Whitney. By Mrs. Sara E. H. Lockwood. Boston: Ginn & Co.

It has been a common criticism on Professor Whitney's "Essentials of English Grammar," that it was too difficult for school use. Appreciating this, Mrs. Lockwood with the author's permission has adapted the more elaborate book in order "to furnish a simple and practical text book for pupils who are not of sufficient maturity to use with advantage the original work." The adaptation consists in simplifying the book by omitting considerable portions, as for instance chapters III and IV, by restatement in simpler language, and by adding numerous exercises for practice and illustration. Mrs. Lockwood has before this acquired a reputation by her excellent book "Lessons in English," so that she was well fitted to add those practical features so necessary to a successful text-book in America.

Apart from this Mrs. Lockwood has made few additions to the "Essentials." One or two that have been noticed may perhaps be somewhat criticised without doing injustice to the generally excellent character of the book. Under possessives we find this sentence: "Sometimes, however, we use both the preposition and the possessive form of the noun; for example, I will show you a picture of my brother's; He is a servant of the general's." There is here no suggestion that the form is a colloquialism, scarcely to be used by a careful writer of the present time. Another addition has been made under the heading of the present

tense. "The present tense is sometimes used with reference to what is past or future, when we wish to make it vivid and distinct." One of the examples given to exemplify this is, "He enters college next year." In fact, however, this last is only an example of a very old use of the present to signify future time, past action alone being put in the present tense for vividness. Such a mistake would not have been made if the author had possessed an historical knowledge of the language. The importance of the latter, both for the writer of a school grammar and for a teacher of the subject, can hardly be overestimated. But notwithstanding some points that might be improved, we very gladly testify to the excellent character of this new English Grammar.

—Oliver Farrar Emerson.

The *Great Commanders Series*\* edited by General James Grant Wilson presents a most attractive announcement. Two volumes have thus far been issued, *Admiral Farragut* by Captain A. T. Mahan, U. S. A. and *General Taylor* by General O. O. Howard. The intrinsic interest of the subjects as well as the distinction of the authors leads us to expect much, and the expectation is fully realized. This effort to satisfy the general demand for a series of convenient, readable, popular but attractive biographies of illustrious American leaders on land and sea deserves success. The two volumes thus far issued would certainly be an addition to any school library. Indeed, it is hard to see how such a library can get along without them. The books are handsomely and durably bound, elegantly printed, and illustrated with a fine steel plate portrait of the subject of each as well as adequate maps.

In his *Handy Book of Literary Curiosities*\* Mr. Walsh frankly proclaims that his primary object is to entertain and even goes so far as to say that he had thought of entitling the book a "Dictionary of Things not Worth Knowing." Nevertheless it treats of things which most people wish to know, and there is withal a very considerable proportion of valuable as well as entertaining matter. The book is an extensive repository of out-of-the-way facts otherwise not easily accessible, if accessible at all, and for the teacher it cannot fail to be of much service. In a school reference library it would probably be frequently consulted and would have a distinctive value in connection with the work in English composition especially. It furnishes a store-house of materials for such work. A special feature of the book is its quite complete collection of Americanisms.

\*See Books Received.

*Compayré's Elements of Psychology*\* is a book of such eminent value to teachers that Chancellor Payne undoubtedly rendered a real service to the teachers of the country by translating this work from the French, thus making it readily accessible to all. His translation has been already long enough before the public to have its merits widely recognized. In this place and at this time, perhaps it is enough to say that it is a book which should be regarded as absolutely indispensable for every professional teacher. That a true psychology is the basis of a true education no longer admits of question. Mere empiric methods have doubtless had their day. Not every teacher, of course, can become a specialist in psychology. This book of Compayré's is a book containing the essentials of psychology in readily intelligible English and in the best form for dissemination among those who need them, first of all, for the application they can make of them.

Mr. Dole's work on *The American Citizen*\* has not been so long before the public that it will be out of place here to commend cordially both the work itself and the purpose that prompts it. In the words of the author "only a few scholars can be expected to go to college or to take a full course in Political Economy and Politics, but all must become citizens, with the responsibility of acting in private and in public upon various grave and difficult problems. They ought not surely to meet these problems without some intelligent and serious view of their meaning." If there is any subject, the claim of which to a place in the school curriculum should be unquestioned it is that subject about which it is of prime importance to every person to know something. Unquestionably, one subject which can make universally good this claim is the subject of Civics. It is not enough to leave this matter to the Colleges and Universities. Something must be done for the sake of the 75 per cent. of High School students who do not go to College. It is possible in every High School, and probably in Grammar schools where students do not go to the High School, to teach the elements of Civil Government and of Political Economy, implanting once for all in the minds of the students sound, if elementary, notions in regard to money, the nature of the ballot, the functions of government, etc., which would be to them through life a bulwark against the specious pleas of the demagogue. Mr. Dole's book covers in brief space a wide field which may, perhaps, be summarized as the whole duty of man in society. Its defects are those inherent to an attempt to cover a large field in a small book. It needs to be supplemented by the teacher. The suggestion of the author that it be used as an advanced reading book seems an admirable one. As a text book for the advanced class in the High School the style is perhaps a trifle too elementary.

\*See Books Received.

The compilers of *Selections for Memorizing*\* have aimed especially at making a book that should contain matter adapted for each of the three grades ordinarily found in schools, primary, intermediate, and high school. Their aim has been to present matter that is good literature, inculcates good morals and teaches patriotism. With their statement of belief that, when the custom of having declamations in schools died out, something was lost that was well worth saving, many experienced teachers will heartily agree. The selections for the primary grades have received special care. The work of two such experienced educators cannot fail to be of great usefulness in this line.

Miss Yonge's *Book of Golden Deeds*\* is so well and favorably known that it needs no introduction or commendation. First printed in the famous *Golden Treasury Series*, it has been reprinted by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. in their "school library." As a book for supplementary reading it is worthy of a place in every such collection. The stories of moral and personal heroism are such as delight and inspire young readers.

---

#### Current Educational Literature.

*The Training of Secondary Teachers in Germany.*—The London *Journal of Education* for December prints a long paper by Mr. J. J. Findlay on professional training in Germany which is to be followed by another paper of suggestions for England. He summarizes in convenient form the German requirements and shows that what is generally reported as the German standard is in reality the *minimum* and does not fully represent the *opportunities* offered for pedagogical study.

"For fifty years, previous to 1890, every secondary teacher in Germany had to study for four years, to attend a satisfactory number of lectures, to pass a public examination, and then to work in a school under a headmaster's direction for a year (*Probejahr*), without fee. At the end of this year, if the headmaster reported favorably, he was accepted as a qualified teacher, and could take a post, if he could get one; he became entitled also to the usual privileges (pension, etc.) enjoyed by all civil servants."

In 1890 a serious change was introduced into Prussia and into Saxe-Weimar. It was found by experience that the *Probejahr* did not give the necessary practical training, hence the establishment of so-called "*Gymnasial Seminars*, or as we should call them, day training classes, associated with certain grammar schools." At the request of the Minister of Education some sixty

---

\*See Books Received.

headmasters of upper schools volunteered to undertake the training of young teachers in a properly conducted Seminar (with criticism lessons, discussions, etc.)"

To qualify for the office of *Oberlehrer* one must pursue the following course:—" (1.) Four years' study and attendance at University lectures. (2.) An examination, partly written, but mainly oral, (a) in one or more special branches of knowledge—classics, science, geography, or the like (these may be multiplied and modified in many directions); (b) in general studies, which are made to include psychology and ethics, and pedagogics. (3.) After this examination, a year of training in a course attached to a school (*Seminarjahr*). (4.) Finally, a year of trial, in which this training may or may not be continued (*Probejahr*)."

If, heretofore, the tendency in German professional training has been too much towards the theory, there is a feeling now that the two years of practice are not always necessary. A year under the guidance of an efficient headmaster coupled with the study required, and the opportunity for both seeing and taking part in class work should render the *Probejahr* unnecessary.

Mr. Findlay describes at some length the methods followed at Jena, at Halle and at Giessen, in teaching general pedagogics as distinguished from the practical work of the *Seminarjahr* and the *Probejahr*. The work, though largely theoretical, is practical in that students observe and criticise actual teaching in real schools. The schools are small—often a private pupil suffices—and the fullest opportunity is given for discussion between the head-teacher and the student-teachers. But at present much in a practical way is expected from the year of apprenticeship following the University course.

"It is too soon to say how far these *Gymnasial Seminars* are likely to be accepted as a solution of the problem of secondary training in Germany. But the *fact* of their establishment is the main consideration for us at this moment."

—J. E. R.

*Wherein Popular Education Has Failed.*—In the *Forum* for December, President Charles W. Eliot points out that "at the end of two generations of sincere and strenuous if sometimes, misdirected, effort," the looked-for results of popular education have not been realized. There is a general discontent among all classes and public happiness is thereby repressed. Skeptical observers complain that free education is made to subserve personal and selfish ends, "that lawless violence continues to break out just as it did before common schools were thought of", that corruption in politics goes on unchecked, that the "distinctions between rich and poor are not diminished, but intensified", that the horrible waste and cruelty of war are not abolished or even abated and that dishonesty in labor, disloyalty, mutual jealousy and distrust between employer and employed, have increased.

"These indictments against universal education as a cure for ancient wrongs and evils are certainly formidable; but they exaggerate existing evils and leave out of sight great improvements in social conditions which the last two generations have seen." But universal education is not a panacea for all ills. "There was a time when it was held that a true and universally accepted religious belief would bring with it an ideal state of society." The belief in the infallibility of modern representative institutions, and later in universal suffrage, has proved delusive. "Public education should mean the systematic training of all children for the duties of life";—if too much has been expected there is yet cause for thinking it has fallen short of what may justly be required.

"Let me, therefore, present here in some detail the main processes or operations of the mind which systematic education should develop and improve in an individual in order to increase his general intelligence and train his reasoning power. The first of these processes or operations is *observation*; that is to say, the alert, intent, and accurate use of all the senses. . . . "For the training of this power of observation it does not matter what subject the child studies, so that he studies something thoroughly in an observational method." Next in order is "the function of making a correct record of things observed." This implies a careful and critical use of language, spoken and written. The next mental function is "the faculty of drawing correct inferences from recorded observations. . . . It is often a long way from the patent fact to the just inference. For centuries the Phœnician and Roman navigators had seen the hulls of vessels disappearing below the blue horizon of the Mediterranean while their sails were visible; but they never drew the inference that the earth was round. . . . Fourthly, education should cultivate the power of expressing one's thoughts clearly, concisely, and cogently. This power is to be procured only by much practice in the mother tongue, and this practice should make part of every child's education from beginning to end."

In the primary schools where ninety per cent. of school children receive their entire training, reading, spelling, writing, geography and arithmetic, are the staples of instruction. As commonly taught they train only the memory. In the secondary schools far too much time is given to the study of languages. "The ordinary teaching of a foreign language, living or dead, cultivates in the pupil little besides memory and a curious faculty of assigning the formation of a word or the construction of a phrase to the right rule in the grammar—a rule which the pupil may or may not understand. . . . I need not say that these subjects are in themselves grand fields of knowledge and that any one of them might furnish the solidest mental training. It is the way they are used that condemns them."



"If now we rise to the course which succeeds that of the high school or academy, the college course, we find essentially the same condition of things in most American institutions. The cultivation of the memory predominates; that of the observing, inferring, and reasoning faculties is subordinated. Strangest of all from bottom to top of the educational system, the art of expressing one's thought clearly and vigorously in the mother tongue receives comparatively little attention."

"What, then, are the changes in the course of popular education which we must strive after if we would develop for the future more successfully than in the past the rationality of the population? In the first place, we must make practice in thinking, or in other words the strengthening of reasoning power, the constant object of all teaching, from infancy to adult age, no matter what may be the subject of instruction. . . . One pupil can be induced most easily to exercise strenuously his powers of observation and discrimination on the facts of a language new to him, another on the phenomena of plant life, and another on the events of some historical period". But from the kindergarten through the University there should prevail such studies as will enable the learner to think more wisely of the conditions of his daily life and to draw sounder conclusions from his observations.

—J. E. R.

*Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, November, 1892.*—Nearly one half the space of this number is given to a dissertation on the life-work of Renan which, though wholly in place in a review devoted to superior instruction, has naturally outside of France a literary rather than a pedagogic interest. This cannot be said of the address delivered by Prof. Brochard at the Sorbonne to the students in the Faculty of Letters at the opening of the courses Nov. 5th. This address is a plea for a greater freedom of intellectual intercourse among students pursuing as well different as similar lines of study, and seems to be aimed at a presumed tendency to intellectual isolation in the interest of originality. The orator urges the benefits to be gained by the free companionship of "different units capable of preserving each its own individuality," through the inspiration of friendly discussion, through keen glancing criticism prompting to added reflection on favorite ideas, through happy suggestions struck out in animated conversation, and through "the collision of ideas whereby their solidity is tested." The dangers to originality which are feared from promiscuous mental commerce, are cleverly ridiculed. "An originality which could so easily be destroyed would be little to be regretted." "Human souls are not like pebbles which lose their shape by the action of the waves. They clash with each other, but each still retains its own proper

form," being only polished by the contact. Finally, signaling the gravity of the social, political, and religious problems in whose solution the students of to-day will soon be called on to bear a part, the professor exhorts his youthful hearers to neglect nothing, whether by ardent study, or by student intercourse, "to speed the time when the ideas and resolves which are now in germ within their souls shall take definite form, to ripen and to fortify that youthful spirit which is soon to be the soul of France."

The review which follows, of the educational articles in the "Great Encyclopedia," now in course of publication, and forming already, though unfinished, twenty-eight volumes of 1200 pages each, clearly indicates that "these articles, reinforced by documents and inspired by a pedagogic sense as healthy as it is progressive, are of a nature to interest and enlighten all friends of education."

Of the matters treated in the *Chronique de l'Enseignement*, the statistics of secondary instruction in Prussia for the school year 1890-91, will be likely to have the greatest interest to American educators, and they are here given. They are taken from the semester in each case that had the largest number of teachers and pupils; and remembering that the population of Prussia is about 28,000,000, they may be found useful for comparison.

	No. of Teachers.	No. of Pupils.
Gymnasien . . . . .	4,875	77,811
Pro-Gymnasien . . . . .	414	4,748
Real Gymnasien . . . . .	1,665	23,951
Real Pro-Gymnasien . . . . .	638	8,393
Higher Real Schulen . . . . .	228	3,831
Real Schulen . . . . .	391	6,568
Higher Bürger Schulen . . . . .	539	9,806
	8,750	135,108

—The inaugural address of Prof. von Christ as rector of Munich University, in the October number, can hardly fail to interest all who are engaged in secondary and university instruction. It deals with the questions of university methods, and of the best modes of introducing young men to original work; but many of its considerations are equally pertinent to higher secondary instruction. The beneficial changes that have gradually taken place in university methods with the growth of subjects of lively human interest, are described as introductory to other changes which the rector thinks would be improvements. Chief of these changes is that the current lecture system should be largely supplemented by conferences, by oral discussions, and by the written presentation of the ideas that students have gained

or conceived as the result of lectures. In all subjects that admit of application the student should be required to *do* as well as *know*, and hence should not only be encouraged to do independent work, but should receive wise direction in his first efforts. The address closes with a sketch of the seminary work in Munich.

—S. G. Williams.

*In decided contrast* with President Eliot's recommendations for popular education is Professor Patrick's article in the December *Educational Review*. The one complains that most of our teaching requires little more than memorizing; the other claims that a century of neglect under the new educational ideas shows a loss in the power of memory. Scholars used to know what they knew, now what they know they know where to find in their libraries. Mr. Patrick maintains that "the new education is essentially the education of the critic." The educated man is a "specialist but by no means a scholar. . . . If we had good memories, we might be specialists and still be scholars." Too much time is devoted to relearning what has been forgotten. A small increment of such wasted effort would, if judiciously applied, so train our memories that what we once learn would be retained. "Hitherto when any attention at all has been given to memory-training, it has been indirectly, in connection with other work. . . . *Absolute thoroughness* in a certain limited, definite amount of memory-work is the thing of prime importance."

—J. E. R.

*The private school-masters* of England are getting very nervous over the possible re-introduction and passage of Mr. Acland's bill relative to the secondary schools. They have formed an association for the protection of their interests and the president, Mr. J. Vine Milne, issues in the *Educational Times* (London) a call for aid. He declares that the proposed legislation is unjust and supports his view by this argument: "Private school-masters have shown in the past that they fear no legitimate competition, but no profession, or trade either, can hold its own against rate-supported competitors."

—J. E. R.

*England's Problem in Secondary Education.*—The *Educational Times* (London) gives a full account of the speech of the Rt. Hon. Arthur Acland, M. P., at the opening of a school at Birmingham. It is of decided interest in view of the "Bill to Promote Secondary Education in England" which it is expected that Mr. Acland will introduce when Parliament meets. He expressed satisfaction that the school was to be free. "Nothing seemed to him more dangerous in education than that schools, as they got higher, began to charge fees. That meant that the fees began exactly at the moment when parents wanted encouragement to send their children to school, and when for this purpose fees, if any were charged at all, should cease

to be charged." He was glad to see that it provided a department for the training of girls. "There were some parts of the country, some ancient seats of learning, where—he feared by some who ought to know better—the education of women was looked upon in a somewhat grudging spirit. . . . The great need of the present time was effective organization of education above what was ordinarily called the elementary sphere." Especially in the less populated districts the great need was for improved municipal organization and with it proper educational advantages. He urged "more effective co-operation between the teachers of all classes and also between them and the governing bodies over them." He pointed out that Scotland, Wales and most of the continent, were far ahead of England in these respects. "The secondary education was to be a wide education, with a wide curriculum, embracing science, art, literature, history, languages—as broad and generous an education as they might desire." But why should the state interfere in municipal or county affairs? "Well, he did not want to interfere at all, but he was not sure the opinion was not growing that the State had a work to do in advising, in counselling, in letting one part of the country know what was being done in another part, which, instead of interfering, was assistance of the best and most important kind. The interests of the public and private schools, which were of a more extensive character, must not be allowed to interfere with the organized education, which was to be both popular and cheap, and available in all the different districts of the country which required it. . . . If he wished to see teachers more closely associated with one another by degrees until they got real Educational Councils in the great centres, and ultimately a great Educational Council at the centre, it was because he in his turn wanted a little fostering care. The great mistake in the past had been that the 'Departments' which were so constantly abused, saw too little of their abusers. What was wanted was that those who were constantly engaged in the work of education should from time to time in some methodical manner give to the authorities at Whitehall and South Kensington the best advice they could give. If the State had something to do in the way of advice and counsel he was perfectly certain also that those at headquarters were much better for visits and advice, and that very often they did not get the visits and advice from those most fitted to advise them." He hoped the time was near when "the local educational authorities would not look upon the national resources and on themselves as so many sponges."

*A convenient summary of the principles upon which the Gouin method of teaching languages is founded is given in the Educational Times as follows: "That language is chiefly concerned with the tongue; that exercises in language should be sense, not*

nonsense ; that words are not the most important part of language, thoughts presenting themselves in a series of mental pictures ; that in the process of organization the basis is the verb ; and, finally, the principle of elimination of everything that was not within the range of ideas of the pupils to be instructed. The mental picture is the key to the method, the principle that all varieties of action are capable of being visualized."

—J. E. R.

### Books Received.

#### *From D. Appleton & Co.*

Story of Columbus, by Elizabeth Eggleston Seelye ; with ninety-nine illustrations by Allegra Eggleston ; edited with an introduction by Edward Eggleston. pp. 303.

Abraham Lincoln, the True Story of a Great Life, by William H. Herndon and Jesse W. Weik, with an introduction by Horace White. 2 vols.

Great Commanders ; General Taylor, by Oliver Otis Howard, Major-General U. S. Army ; with portrait and maps. pp. 378.

Great Commanders ; Admiral Farragut, by Captain A. T. Mahan, U. S. Navy, President of the U. S. Naval War College. Portrait and maps. pp. 333.

#### *From Leach, Shewell & Sanborn, Boston and New York.*

An Introduction to Qualitative Chemical Analysis by the Inductive Method. A Laboratory Manual for Colleges and High Schools, by Delos Fall, M.S., Professor of Chemistry, Albion College. pp. 84.

Stories for Children, containing simple lessons in Morals. A Supplementary Reader for Schools or for use at home, by Lucretia P. Hale. pp. 216. Price 40c.

Joan of Arc and other selections from Thomas De Quincey with introductory and explanatory notes by Henry H. Belfield, Ph.D., Director of the Chicago Manual Training School. pp. 166. Price 42c.

#### *From the American Book Company.*

English Classics for Schools :—

The Comedy of Twelfth Night ; or, What You Will, by William Shakespear. pp. 99.

The Sir Roger De Coverley Papers from the Spectator, by Addison, Steele, and Rudgell. pp. 148.

The Tragedy of Julius Cæsar, by William Shakespear. pp. 114.

The Second Essay on the Earl of Chatham (William Pitt), by Lord Macaulay. pp. 109.

Ivanhoe; A Romance, by Sir Walter Scott, Bart.

Ten Selections from The Sketch Book, by Washington Irving. pp. 149.

*From Ginn & Co.:*

The Beginner's American History, by D. H. Montgomery, author of the Leading Facts of History Series. pp. 234.

Selections for Memorizing, for Primary, Intermediate and High School grades, compiled by L. C. Foster, Superintendent of Schools, Ithaca, N. Y., and Sherman Williams, Superintendent of Schools, Glens Falls, N. Y. pp. 195.

*From Charles Scribner's Sons:*

The Realm of Nature, an Outline of Physiography, by Hugh Robert Mill, D.Sc. Edin., Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh; Oxford University Extension Lecturer; with nineteen coloured maps and sixty-eight illustrations. pp. 366.

The Study of Animal Life, by J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., F.R.S.E., Lecturer on Zoology, School of Medicine, Edinburgh; Joint-Author of The Evolution of Sex, Author of Outlines of Zoology. pp. 375.

The Colonial Era, by George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale University. pp. 348.

*From Henry Holt & Co.:*

Greek Lessons—Part I, The Greek in English; Part II, The Greek of Xenophon, by Thomas D. Goodell, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Yale University. pp. 376. Teacher's price \$1.25.

Nature Study for Common Schools, by Wilbur S. Jackman, A.B., Teacher of Natural Science, Cook County Normal School, Chicago, Ill.; second edition revised. pp. 448. Teacher's price \$1.20.

*From Macmillan & Co.:*

The Story of the Iliad, by the Rev. Alfred J. Church, M.A., lately Professor of Latin in University College, London. pp. 314. Price 50 cts.

A Book of Golden Deeds of All Times and All Lands, gathered and narrated by the Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." pp. 450. Price 50 cts.



Stories from the Greek Comedians, Aristophanes, Philemon, Diphilus, Menander, Apollodorus, by Rev. Alfred J. Church, M.A., lately Professor of Latin in University College, London; with sixteen illustrations after the antique. pp. 344.

The Beauties of Nature and the Wonders of the World We Live in, by the Right Hon. Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D. pp. 429.

Institutes of Education, comprising an Introduction to Rational Psychology, designed (partly) as a text-book for Universities and Colleges, by S. S. Laurie, M.A., LL.D., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. pp. 272. Price \$1.

*From Lee and Shepard :*

The Picturesque Geographical Readers, by Charles F. King. No. 4. pp. 230.

A Pathfinder in American History, by W. F. Gordy, Principal North Grammar School Hartford, Conn., and W. I. Twichell, Principal Arsenal Grammar School, Hartford, Conn. Part I. pp. 102.

The Elements of Psychology by Gabriel Compayré, translated by William H. Payne, Ph.D., LL.D., Chancellor of the University of Nashville, and President of the Peabody Normal College. pp. 315.

*From Harper & Brothers :*

The Principles of Ethics, by Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. pp. 309.

*From D. C. Heath & Co. :*

The American Citizen, by Charles F. Dole. pp. 326.

English Grammar, with chapters on Composition, Versification, Paraphrasing and Punctuation, by J. M. D. Meiklejohn M.A., Professor of the Theory, History and Practice of Education in the University of St. Andrews, Scotland. pp. 252.

A Compendious French Grammar, in two independent parts, (introductory and advanced), by A. Hjalmar Edgren, Ph.D., Professor of Modern Languages and Sanskrit in the University of Nebraska. pp. 293.

A German Grammar for Schools and Colleges based on the Public School German Grammar of A. L. Meissner, M.A., Ph.D., D.Lit., Professor of Modern Languages in Queen's College, Belfast, by Edward S. Joynes, M.A., Professor of Modern Languages in South Carolina University. pp. 384.

American Literature, A Text-Book for the use of Schools and Colleges, by Julian Hawthorn and Leonard Lemmon, Superintendent City Schools, Sherman, Texas. pp. 20.

German Lessons, by Charles Harris, Professor of German Language and Literature, Oberlin College. pp. 172.

Composition and Rhetoric by Practice, with Exercises, adapted for use in High Schools and Colleges, by William Williams, B.A., Editor of Goldsmith's Deserted Village, Cowper's Task, etc. pp. 338.

A New Part-Song and Chorus Book for High Schools, Academies, Choral Societies and families, by Charles E. Whiting, formerly Teacher of Music in the Boston Public Schools. pp. 256.

*From J. B. Lippincott Company :*

Handy-Book of Literary Curiosities, by William S. Walsh, Author of *Faust : The Poem and the Legend*, *Paradoxes of a Philistine*, etc. pp. 1103.

## THE CASCADILLA SCHOOL,

ITHACA, N. Y.

**LOCATION.**—*In an intellectual atmosphere ; adjoining Cornell University ; affording easy access to its libraries, museums, and general lecture courses.*

**RECORD.**—*Sixteen years of successful instruction ; 800 students sent to Cornell—many of them fitted in part for the Sophomore class.*

**INSTRUCTION.**—*Primarily for the individual ; small classes, carefully graded ; promotion as soon as merited ; instructors specialists in their respective departments.*

**ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY.**—*Satisfactory completion of course secures certificate which may be offered instead of entrance examinations.*

**HOME.**—*Supplied with necessary conveniences for health and comfort ; sanitary arrangements complete ; refining influences to develop true manliness.*

**SUMMER SCHOOL.**—*A part of the regular school-work ; pupils admitted at any time ; fits for Fall entrance examinations.*

**PRESIDENT SCHURMAN WRITES :** " *I believe the Cascadilla School to be one of the best preparatory institutions in the country.*"

**FOR REGISTER and Circulars of Information, address,**

**JAMES E. RUSSELL, Principal.**

